

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, October 2, 1995
Volume 31—Number 39
Pages 1669–1748

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Bosnia, peace process—1714
California
 Community in Santa Ana—1669
 O'Farrell Community School in San Diego—1671
Congressional Black Caucus dinner—1685
Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute—1723
Godfrey Sperling luncheon, question-and-answer session—1693
Israeli-Palestinian West Bank Accord
 Reception for heads of state—1733
 Signing ceremony—1731
Middle East peace process—1692
Oklahoma City "Thank You America"—1721
Peace Corps, swearing-in of Mark Gearan as Director—1713
Pennsylvania, arrival at Avoca—1692
Presidential Medal of Freedom, presentation—1734
Radio address—1684
Saxophone Club fundraiser—1715
United Mine Workers convention—1710

Communications to Congress

Export Administration Act of 1979, message transmitting report—1746
Radio spectrum assignments, letter transmitting report—1709
South Africa-U.S. agreement on the peaceful use of nuclear energy, message transmitting—1745

Executive Orders

Amendment to Executive Order No. 12901—1727
Continuance of Certain Federal Advisory Committees—1744

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
 Air Force One—1674
 Briefing Room—1714
 Cabinet Room—1709
 Oval Office—1728, 1729, 1730, 1739, 1742
 Truman Center—1742

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Egypt, President Mubarak—1730, 1731, 1739
Israel, Prime Minister Rabin—1729, 1730, 1731
Jordan, King Hussein—1730, 1742
Palestine Liberation Organization, Chairman Arafat—1728, 1730, 1731

Statements by the President

Bipartisan commitment to our children—1743
Future of Federal laboratories—1708
Tragedy at Elmendorf Air Force Base in Alaska—1683

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1748
Checklist of White House press releases—1748
Digest of other White House announcements—1747
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1747

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, September 29, 1995

**Remarks to the Community
in Santa Ana, California**

September 22, 1995

Thank you very much, Jason, for the introduction. I am delighted to be here with all the officers and members of the Boys & Girls Clubs; Mayor Pulido; to the president of the Police Officers Association, Don Blankenship. Ken Stevens, thank you for this wonderful gift on behalf of Taco Bell for the future of the United States of America. Aren't we proud of Taco Bell for doing this? Isn't it a great thing? I was glad to be standing there with—is it on now? Can you hear me? I was glad to be standing there receiving that check with Jason Reese and Karina Martinez and Shaquille O'Neal. And I thought, the young people make me feel so big, and he makes me feel so small. I can see the headlines tomorrow: "Shaq Visits Santa Ana; President Clinton Also Shows Up." [Laughter] I want to thank the police officers who are here, Chief Walters and Sergeant Follo, for what you said and all the students from the Santa Ana Unified School District high schools and the Pio Pico Elementary School and the Lowell Elementary School.

I am honored to be here, first and most importantly, to support this Teen Supreme alliance between the Boys & Girls Clubs and Taco Bell to fight youth violence and to give our young people a better start in life. And I really want to thank Shaquille O'Neal for getting on an airplane and coming all the way out here to be with us today and, most importantly, for wearing his magnificent talent and his great success in a humble and straightforward way that's a good role model for all the young people of this country and for the message he gave you today.

You know, when I was the Governor of Arkansas and Shaquille O'Neal was in college, playing at LSU, our schools used to play all the time. And I woke up this morning thinking about a particular basketball game,

and I thought, he's going to make me relive that game all over again. And right before we came out, I was in such a good humor. And he put his hand on my shoulder, and I looked at him; he said, "You remember the time we beat Arkansas' brains out and I scored 58 points?" [Laughter] And it was worth losing that game to see him giving the message to you today. You listen to what Shaquille O'Neal said and you won't go wrong with your lives, and you'll have a good life. And that's really what we're all here about.

I want to say to all you young people, every day when I go to work as President I try to spend my time and make decisions thinking about your future. I try to think about what America will be like when you are out of high school, when you are grown, when you have children of your own here at the school where you are today. And I know that we need to do a lot of things in our country to give you a strong economy and the opportunity to make a good living. We desperately, all of us, owe you the opportunity to get a good education. And every young person in this country should be able to go to a good school and then should be able to go on to college, and money should not be an object. And I am working hard for that.

But one of the things that has burdened me the most—Is it on again? There it is. One of the things that has burdened me the most is the knowledge that unless we can give our young people a safe and secure childhood, free of crime and violence, a lot of people will never have the life they ought to have. And when I went to Washington 2½ years ago, I made a promise to myself that I would do everything I can to put more police on our streets, to get more guns and drugs off our streets, to give young people a chance to be in positive situations and out of gangs.

And what we are really here celebrating today is the kind of partnership that makes that possible, because the initiatives of the

mayor and the Boys & Girls Clubs here, the initiatives of Taco Bell, the work of citizen leaders like Shaq, and the work of the police officers here all mean that you can have a safer and more secure future.

I did work hard to make sure these police officers behind me would be in this community and communities like it throughout the country. In the last year, under our crime bill, we have put out 25,000 more police officers in the United States of America to be on the streets protecting our children, preventing crime as well as catching criminals. These people are now working your neighborhoods, patrolling by foot or bicycle, and some are even on electric carts. In some of the small towns in the more rural western parts of our country, they ride horses. But—is it on again? Is it on now? Now? Well, some of you can hear, and the others should pretend to hear. [*Laughter*] Now is it on? Half of you are saying yes; half are saying no. Now? [*Applause*]

These police officers are trying to do something that's very important. They're trying not only to catch criminals, they're trying to prevent crime by being with people in the neighborhoods, in the schools, on the streets, where they live. After all, our objective ultimately is to prevent crime, to keep bad things from happening to our children and their parents. And that's what they represent.

I also think it's important that we try to do some other things to make people safer. That's why, last year, we banned 19 deadly assault weapons from our streets. We don't need Uzis in our schools and on our streets, threatening our children. That's why we passed the "three strikes and you're out" law, because after people commit three serious violent crimes, they shouldn't be back on the streets to terrorize our children and their future. That's why we passed the Brady law which requires people to be checked for their criminal backgrounds before they get a handgun. And last year, last year alone, over 40,000 people who had committed serious crimes were prevented from purchasing handguns. And a lot of little children are alive as a result of that.

What I want to say to all of you today real simply is that we can't do this alone. And we can't do it solely with law enforcement.

We have to have people who are working with our kids, making the speech that Shaq made to you today, telling young people they can have a good life, telling them they have to do right and avoid doing the wrong thing, telling them they ought to be in good organizations and out of gangs that want to hurt people, where people define how important they are by how many people they can hurt and how tough they can be.

You know, one of the most troubling things to me today—and I want to say this especially to the high school students who are here—the mayor said something that was absolutely true, that the crime rate is going down here. Four or 5 years ago, most Americans didn't believe we could drive the crime rate down. The crime rate is down in every State. The crime rate is down in almost every city. But arbitrary crime by teenagers is still going up. And I think it's because there are too many young people who haven't been given the opportunity to be part of a positive environment, where they can have something to say yes to as well as something to say no to; where they know they're going to have a good future; where they're told that they matter; where they're important to everybody and they know that they matter and they can have a good life and they can live out their dreams. Nothing, nothing that we do can take the place of what you can do here in this community to reach out and touch these young people one by one by one; to tell them that they matter; to tell them that they are a gift of God and they can become anything they are willing to work hard enough to be. That is your job, and I'm proud that you're doing it.

Now meanwhile, those of us in Washington have a job, and that is to keep doing what we know works. One of the most troubling things to me about the debate in Washington today is that Congress is actually considering abolishing the program that put these police officers behind me, cutting back on the funding and sending a check to the cities and basically saying, "You do what you want with this money." The last time this was tried, some local governments used the money to buy airplanes, accountants, and tanks. What we want to do is to keep putting people like these fine men and women in uniform, who

are behind me. We need to have more of these police officers. We don't want more young people being shot. We want more people being saved.

So I say to you—I say to you, today the American people are more threatened by what can happen on their own streets than by some country going to war with us. If the United States Congress were going to reduce the national defense of this country to the point where you felt insecure and dangerous, people would be outraged. Well, let me tell you, the gangs of this country, the armed criminals of this country, the people who are willing to shoot people on the street for no other reason than they happen to be there, they represent a threat to the security of America. And it is wrong, wrong, wrong to turn away from our obligation to protect our children with these police officers.

If all of you here will keep doing your job, if you will keep the light in the eyes of these children, if you will convince teenagers in their most difficult years that there is a country that cares about them and there is a good future for them out there and if we do our job in Washington to keep giving communities the tools they need to bring the crime rate down, we can make the American dream live for all these young people into the next century. And 20 or 30 years from now, they can be here making their speeches, looking at another generation of young people, proud and secure in the fact that they had the chance to live out their dreams.

We have to do something about gangs and violence. We have to do something about our children being given up too young, too easily. And we know what to do. We have to do what the Girls & Boys Clubs do. We have to do what this city is doing. We have to do what Taco Bell is doing. And we've got to keep the United States Government on the side of our children, their future, and safety in the streets with this police program. Help us do that, and we'll try to help you.

God bless you all, and thank you for having me here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:18 a.m. at the Boys & Girls Club of Santa Ana. In his remarks, he referred to Jason Reese, Boys & Girls Clubs of America 1995 national youth of the year; Mayor Miguel Pulido of Santa Ana; Kenneth T. Stevens,

vice chairman, Taco Bell Foundation and member, national board of governors, Boys & Girls Clubs of America; Karina Martinez, Boys & Girls Club of Santa Ana 1995 local youth of the year; Paul Walters, chief, and John Follo, sergeant, Santa Ana Police Department; and basketball player Shaquille O'Neal. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at the O'Farrell Community School in San Diego, California

September 22, 1995

Thank you so much. Let's give Henry Walker another hand. Didn't he do a great job? *[Applause]* I sort of want him to keep on talking; I was having a good time. *[Laughter]*

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the warm welcome. Thank you, Congressman Filner. Thank you, Dr. Bertha Pendleton, for doing such a good job with this school district. Thank you, Dr. Bob Stein, the O'Farrell chief educational officer. I want to say a special word of thanks to a group of parents and teachers and students and others who help to make this school successful, who met with me for about a half an hour, before we came out here, to talk about what they were doing. I'd like to ask them to stand up and be recognized. Let's give them a hand. They gave me an education today. *[Applause]*

I want to say to all of you how grateful I am to this school and to all the other schools here present for believing in our children. I believe in zero tolerance, and I thank you for that. I'm trying to get every place in the country to adopt that policy. And most importantly, I believe in the high expectations that are given to all children in this school, because all of your children can learn, and we should expect them to and help them to.

I want you to know why I came here today. You know, I like San Diego, and I came here to sign the Goals 2000 bill, and I like to be in a community that cares about education. But I wanted to come to this school today for a particular reason, and that is because O'Farrell is organized as a charter school. They call it a family. And as a school organized in this way, it's freed of a lot of the

rules and regulations that keep some of our schools all across America from designing their own ways of educating children. They also are held accountable for results, and they do a good job.

I want the American people to see this because there are too many people in America that not only don't have high expectations of our students, they don't have high expectations of our schools anymore, and they don't understand how much good can be done in a good school when people are working together and they believe in their children and the promise of this future.

I have been promoting schools that are organized and operated like this school for more than 3 years now, and I asked the United States Congress to appropriate just a little money, as a part of the Goals 2000 program Congressman Filner referred to, to give schools all across America just a little start-up money if they wanted to become schools that were independent, that were energized, that were high-expectation schools like O'Farrell.

Today I'm pleased to say that the Department of Education has granted another \$6 million to open schools just like this one in 11 States across our country, including more schools in the State of California.

America has to be serious about education. We have to be serious about education if we want to have a strong economy, if we want these young people to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities. If we really believe that our obligation to our children is to give them the ability to make the most of their own lives in the world we are living in, that means education, education, education. We must face it, embrace it, and be glad about it.

I wouldn't be President of the United States today if it weren't for the educational opportunities I had. I was raised by my grandparents until I was 4, boys and girls, and my grandfather left school after the 6th grade. But because I had a chance to go to a good school, I had a chance to get scholarships and loans and jobs to go to college, I had a chance to become President. None of it would have happened if it hadn't been for teachers like your teachers, parents like your parents, community leaders like your com-

munity leaders. It means everything, and it is more important today than it even was when I was your age. We have to give the children of this country a chance to get a good education.

There are a lot of things that have to be done here school by school, that a President can't do much about: teaching our young people to believe in themselves, organizing a system for high expectations and zero tolerance of destructive conduct, pointing out that freedom and opportunity requires a lot of personal responsibility. But I'll tell you something, there are a lot of things that we in public office can do to help. And I am tired of people in public life pointing the fingers at others and saying, you should do better, and then running away from their own responsibilities to education. That's not the example we should be setting for our children in this country.

Just yesterday in San Francisco, I announced a breakthrough that will enable, by the year 2000, every classroom in America to be connected for computers, if we do what people in California have promised to do—business leaders—which is to wire every school in California for the Internet and to do it soon. This is the kind of thing we have to do together.

But you heard Dr. Pendleton talk about the money that these schools get from the National Government to fight for better education for these children. Don't you let anyone convince you that this money cannot be well spent to improve education. And don't you let anyone convince you that we have to cut out this money to balance the Federal budget. It is not true.

I favor balancing the Federal budget, and I have given Congress a plan to do it. I hate the fact that we were up to our ears in debt when I took office. We had a deficit of \$290 billion a year when I became President, and in 3 years we've cut it from \$290 billion to \$160 billion. I want to go all the way and balance the budget.

But why are we balancing the budget? Because we care about our children. We want to lift the burden of debt off of them. We want to have a stronger economy for them. We want America to work better. Those are our values. If those are our values, we cannot

balance the budget by destroying our commitment to education. Otherwise, we won't help our children and we won't strengthen our economy. So I say to you, my fellow Americans, we can balance the budget and increase our investment in education. And that is exactly what we ought to do.

We need to make sure our schools are safe and drug-free. We need to make sure when little children show up for school that they've been given a chance to get off to a good start. We need to make sure that schools that don't have the resources on their own can still have smaller classes and have technology and have the ability to have those higher expectations that were talked about here today. And your National Government has an obligation to help you do that. That is what I am fighting for in Washington today.

The right way to balance the budget is to balance the budget while keeping our commitments and our values to the future of our children intact. That's what I am fighting for. You heard Congressman Filner talk about it.

The alternative budget in Washington today, proposed by the congressional majority, would undermine dramatically our commitment to education. It would cut back on our ability to promote charter schools like this one. It would cut back on our ability to help with smaller classes and more computers. It would cut back on our ability to help assure safe and drug-free schools. It would cut back on our ability to make sure little kids from poor families show up ready to learn. It would cut back on the availability of scholarships to go to college and on the availability of low-cost college loans.

Now, California has seen what happens when you cut back on the availability of people to go to college. You have a decline in enrollment in your colleges because of the cost. I want to lower the cost and increase the enrollment of ordinary Americans in a college education.

I come here to San Diego to say to you that when things are really important in America, we ought to act like a family the way the O'Farrell family works.

Education is our meal ticket to the future. Let me tell you something, folks: There's not a country in the world in a better position for the next century, for the global economy,

for the rapid movement of people and money and ideas and technology around the world. No one is better suited for that than the United States, because we are the greatest country, that has people from everywhere in our country and in our communities. Look around here today and you can see that. Look around here and you can see that.

But if we are going to fulfill our potential as a nation, these children have to fulfill their potential, every one of them. We have to believe in what they can become. We have to believe they can learn. We have to insist that they do learn. We have to help them to learn. And they can learn a very great deal. We have to believe that our schools can work. And yes, we've got to embrace all these new ideas, like charter schools, but we also have to invest in them.

Before I came out here, the students were given a chance to ask me questions, and one of the students who is sitting right back there stood up and said, "If we really care about education, how come we pay professional athletes who never get off the bench 10 times as much as the schoolteachers make?"

This is not about money. It is about our values. It's about what kind of people we are. If you believe that every person should be responsible, that every person should be a good citizen, but that every person should have the opportunity to make the most of his or her own life, then you are required to say we have obligations to each other. We owe something to each other. Yes, we can put a bunch of our money into entertainment and let those folks make a lot, but we have to invest some of our money where our values are, where our future lies, where everybody can come together.

This should not be a partisan political deal. America's existence as a great, free, democracy depends upon developing the ability of all the children who are here and the people they represent all over America. So I ask you, I ask you, without regard to your political party, your income, what you do for a living, your ethnic background, if you believe this, if you believe this, if you believe that one of these little kids could grow up to be President of the United States, with a good education, if you believe that all of these little children can assure that America will remain

the strongest, greatest country in the world, if you believe it is not an accident that people here have gotten together and done something that is the envy of America in education, then I plead with you, send a message to the Congress that it shouldn't be a matter of partisan politics, we must balance the budget and invest in education to keep faith with the future of our children and the future of America.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:39 p.m. in the courtyard. In his remarks, he referred to Henry Walker, parent of an O'Farrell Community School student; Bertha Pendleton, superintendent, San Diego Unified School District; and Bob Stein, chief educational officer, O'Farrell Community School. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Exchange With Reporters on Air Force One

September 22, 1995

Charter Schools

The President. [*The President's remarks are joined in progress.*—education speech, but when I saw the venue today I couldn't do it. There were kids, they were happy; I just couldn't do it. But this school, I have been—we got the DLC interested in this before I ever thought I'd be running for President in '92, the whole idea of charter schools, because one of the biggest problems with public education is there are too many people telling the teachers and the principals what to do—levels of authority but not enough genuine accountability and not a sort of organized entrepreneurialism in the schools.

So these charter schools—like this guy calls himself the CEO of the school instead of the principal. And they come up with a theme and they develop a culture and develop all the kind of community services, as well as all the parents—they have an organized influence. It's a tough neighborhood. And those children that were talking to me were very articulate. They showed me their work, very high-quality work. And they really just hammer on these kids that they can all learn, doesn't matter what their background

or their income is, they matter, they can learn.

They got rid of the—there's no principal, no vice principal, no counselors, no nothing; everybody is organized in these small clusters that they call families—Family A or Family B.

Q. Oh, so that's what's the Family B—

The President. Yes. Yes, Family B is—that's the way they organize it. And they've got a certain number of teachers per students. So it's like—they've got like a 1 to 20 ratio, because they don't have any sort of administrative-service infrastructure. I think it's a little more—it was 7 to 160, I think. And so every student has a teacher who is also a counselor, a friend, a mentor, as well as an educator. And they've reduced the drop-out rate, and their performance levels on the basic scores are basically at or above the California and the national averages, even though their social-economic profile would tend to put them way below.

And it's very interesting to watch it. And I'm convinced it's because—these charter schools, in effect, it's a way of having school choice that's as close as you can get to vouchers without going to vouchers and still keep the money you need in the public schools, because it's not like a magnet school where the people that go there may tend to be super—the more intelligent kids only, or higher I.Q. kids, because—and that case, although it's a school of choice, you can opt not to go there or opt to go there. Most of them are neighborhood kids that you saw. They were basic—[*inaudible*].

But the whole idea of the charter school is that you're part of the school district for funding purposes, but you're an independent operating unit. And Bertha Davenport, the woman who is a school superintendent, a very impressive woman, and she succeeded Tom Payzant, who was also very successful, and Dick Riley brought him to the Department of Education to try to promote this. So a lot of superintendents don't like charter schools because they lose control of the schools, but her idea is—she said, "I'm not running these schools; I just created a climate, set expectations, make sure the trains run on time." So she's got nine of them.

And one of the things we did with the Goals 2000 program and with the rewrite of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last year was to get the Congress to put out a little money just to fund school reforms, because if you switch from a regular school to one of these charter schools you need some extra money that aren't in the school districts' budgets, the money is—like to organize kind of planning sessions and figure out how you're going to redo the whole thing. So that's what I announced today. But it is an example of what we tried to do to invest more in education but to deregulate it, without lowering the standards—in fact, we're trying to deregulate it and raise the level of accountability.

So it's great. So these little independent operating—[inaudible]—and they will basically have contracts with their school districts with performance standards. And they'll either meet or exceed them, or they won't. And if they won't, then their charter can be jerked.

It's very exciting. There's no such thing as a cure-all, but you saw what happened. I mean, one of the things that I always was amazed by is that when schools had a monopoly on customers and a monopoly on money and districts were sort of independent of one another, there were not incentives to copy what works. And I think one of the most—the thing that I keep hammering home is, almost every problem in our country's education system has been solved pretty well by somebody, somewhere. But there's no—it's not centralized like the Japanese system, for example, where they can say, "This works in Kyoto; here's how it works. Everybody will institute this in 60 days, show up 10 days from now, and we'll have a training session about how to do it." We don't have that, but it's not entrepreneurially decentralized like a competitive environment.

For example, Sam Walton was the best entrepreneur I ever met. And way into his old age, until he got very sick, he was still getting on his one-horse airplane and flying to some town where he was opening a new store. And he'd go check out his store; then he'd go down to K-Mart and start wandering, and he'd say hello, and he'd introduce—he'd say, "Who are you?" He wouldn't tell them he

was Sam Walton. You'd say, "I'm John Palmer," and he'd say, "Well, Mr. Palmer, how long have you been shopping at K-Mart? If you don't mind my asking, what are you in to buy? How do these people treat you? If you have a defective product can you get your money back?" He did that, and he did it in the large stores and he did it in small stores. In other words, he thought, no matter how big he got he had to at least equal his competition. And if they were doing something for his customers, it was not only bad business, it was unethical for him not to do for his customers what his competition was doing. And in different, less explicit, less organized ways, that's the way a market works in the best sense.

But I found that when—we had a little old school that was a semi-version of this, a great school in a little rural county in Arkansas. And we got them permission from the Federal Government to take all their Title I funds and some of this special-ed funds in the first grade and get rid of all the separate classes and put them all together. And we went down to 1 to 15 in this poor school district. There were three kids that had been held back. The next year they quadrupled their test scores. There was an 80 percent increase in the scores of the Chapter I kids the next year over the previous year and a 67 percent increase in overall scores in the first grade. They even had first graders working in teams, learning together, doing collective work, which, by the way, we know how that really works. And I actually was paying people from other school districts, their expenses, to come look at what these people did.

And we found that there were school districts that were reluctant to copy it because it would be like admitting failure. And others who didn't copy it because it was too much trouble, everybody—[inaudible]—or they thought it was some fad that—[inaudible]. But the lesson is that things can get better, schools can perform at world-class standards, more kids in racially integrated—[inaudible]—economically isolated places can do well.

Q. [Inaudible]

The President. It's like trying to turn a battleship around or it's basically trying to

hold 400 ping-pong balls in your arms, because it's—but the point is when you get something that works, if you can get enough visibility to it, people can be looking at it and involved in it, and you basically—you empower the parents and the students and all these other people who come in here.

There was a very impressive man from the State social services there who talked about how he brought in—if all these kids had any problems, about all the services at the school. And he said, “All these pathologies are in our communities, but all the antibodies are, too,” which I thought was a real—great one-liner.

So what I tried to do is to put the Federal Government in the business of adding funding where it's needed, holding up things that work, having high standards but not adding to the problem of over-regulation. Riley has reduced Federal regulations in education by about 40 percent since he's been there. And this is a program that has, at the State level, an enormous amount of support—[inaudible]—as you might imagine.

So parenthetically, it helps make the case for why we should cut the education funding in the balanced budget debate. But it also shows that there is a way to make schools work better, to have high expectations of kids, and to get some results. One of the things I find is that there's so much—people tend to give up now. They tend to think, “Oh, the schools can't be made to work well,” or “The crime rate will never go down.” But those things just aren't true.

So—and this was an extraordinary school, which is why I really wanted to go there. I thought we could really juice it up.

Q. Is it hard to explain to people how these sort of public-private or public-local partners—I mean, the technology initiative yesterday, the Goals 2000—I mean, they are a lot more complicated than most people understand.

The President. Yes.

Mood of the Country

Q. But in the face of everybody saying less government, it's hard to explain this sort of thing.

The President. Well, what I'm trying to—like I said in my speeches this week, psycho-

logically, they've got an easier argument. If a majority of people are anxiety-ridden and worried about the country, they can say, “We're moving into a new era, and the problem is the Government, and the Government is spending too much time on immigration, welfare, and affirmative action—too much of your money. Therefore, just get rid of it; less is better.” It's a harder argument to say, “We're moving into a time of change; we're all going to have to change. We need to be faithful to our values. What works is having the right vision, working together, and working for the future.” But if you can find some summary ways to say that, then the San Francisco announcement on the computers or the San Diego announcement on the charter schools, they become like ornaments on a Christmas tree. But the programs have to be secondary to people's understanding of what's happening and the vision and the values behind it, so that the programs become like ornaments on a Christmas tree.

That's why I keep saying this budget debate fundamentally is not about funding. It's about the choices we make about money.

Transition Period

Q. Mr. President, what was it that got you thinking about this sort of 100-year change that—I mean, were you just sort of reading since—

The President. Well, for years I felt like most people, I've been aware for a long—I began to talk about the wage stagnation and the relationship in the social disintegration and the wage stagnation at least 8 or 9 years ago, before I heard anybody else talking about it. I just studied—because I study data all the time. When I was a Governor and I was trying to restructure the economy, I just studied a lot of things that were—looked like boring numbers but could be made—but had real-life stories around them.

But when I ran for President, I believed that if I had the right sort of economic policy, which was to grow jobs in the private sector and try to pursue strategies that will increase the number of high-wage jobs, facilitate defense conversion, and raise skill levels in the work force, we could grow jobs, grow entrepreneurs, and raise the incomes. I thought if we had a social policy that emphasized

helping people to help themselves, helping people that need help but imposing responsibility and accountability, that we could reform welfare and do all these other things. And I thought if we had a Government that was strong but smaller and more entrepreneurial, that was more oriented toward results and less oriented toward regulation, we could build broad support for it.

And we did all that. We had a huge amount of success in the first 2 years. And the Congress—the Democrats actually moved a long way—however you want to say it—either to the center or into the future. But there was no perception of it on the part of the voters. Part of it the Republicans spent a lot more time and money on communication, as opposed to governance. But they hadn't been in the governing business for a long time, so they could do it. And part of it was that there was no way for people to feel it. They had these feelings about the way their lives were.

And after the election was over, I basically spent—I spent a lot of time trying to understand what was driving the mind-set of voters in terms of what was happening in their lives and try to tie what's going on here to what's going on in the rest of the world. And I finally realized that the depth of the changes—you know, it's one thing to say it's a post-cold-war era, the global economy, the information age, and another thing to try to come to grips with the fact that the depth of the changes in the way we live and work and relate to each other and the rest of the world are, in my judgment, greater than at any time in 100 years.

So I started looking for historical parallels. And it started with people saying, you know, this is going to be like Truman, all that kind of stuff—you know, what people say about '48. And I think the psychological dynamics are a lot like '48, where we had to come down off World War II, we had to make all these economic adjustments, there was no common—[inaudible]—to weld us together. If there was, it was—[inaudible]—into exhaustion. The psychological dynamics were—[inaudible]—but the underlying reality was different, because, basically, even in the Great Depression, we knew we had a great industrial country; we just had to figure out how

to make it work again, how to get out of this Depression.

But this is something different. The way we live and the way we work is really changing. And so I started going back into history, and I read—and I started trying to read things that would—triggered it. And finally, I realized, thinking about the beginning of the progressive era, basically, from Teddy Roosevelt to Woodrow Wilson, that the same kinds of things were being done. We changed the way we live; we changed the way we work; we changed the idea of what the role of Government was; we defined our relationships to each other in different ways. We never had to worry about child labor on the farm; nobody would have thought of—a farmer couldn't let his kid work 12 hours a day, 6 days a week on the farm, except when he was in school, you know. And we changed our relationship to the rest of the world.

I mean, when we got into World War I—it started with Teddy Roosevelt, even a little before Roosevelt, with the antitrust laws which said we were not going for socialism in the industrial age but we had to have competition to avoid the evils of a monopoly. Then we got into child labor. Then we got into the idea that we could destroy our natural heritage by abusing the environment—Teddy Roosevelt wanted to preserve the environment. And then Woodrow Wilson did a lot of other progressive things. We enacted the progressive income tax, to pay for things that we had to do together in an industrial society, that we couldn't do apart.

And then, lo and behold, after this whole tradition of isolationism—the biggest war we ever fought was the one we fought with each other—we wound up having to come into World War I basically to ensure the victory of the good guys and what we believed in. And if you go back—and it took about 20 years. So if you look at the way things are today, you see the same sort of thing, with a lot of good things and a lot of bad things and all these anomalies. The economy comes back, the wages stay flat. The crime rate goes down, our juvenile crime goes bad. Peace in our time, with all these isolated acts of madness. And it's the same sort of deal. And so we have to work our way through it.

And as President, one of my big jobs is—and I neglected that the first 2 years—I think. The first 2 years I knew exactly what I wanted to do, and I went about doing them. And I was obsessed with doing them. A lot of it required the Congress to go along. And I would have been better served, I think, and the country probably would have been better served if maybe we had done—even if we had done just slightly less, if people had understood sort of the big picture more. And the President, in a way, has to impart that big picture.

And there were times when I did it, like in that Memphis speech, for example. But if you go back and look at Lincoln's speeches, for example, he was always explaining the time people were living in and putting the big issues in terms of choices that had to be made, so that he basically never let the people off the hook.

Q. You mean like now we are engaged in the great Civil War, testing whether or not——

The President. Yes, yes, his Second Inaugural—one side could make war rather than stay in the Union, and the other side would accept war rather than see the Union rend apart. And the war came. It was all about choices.

And one of the—the traditional rap on the Republican and Democrats' tradition is that the Democrats believe that Government could solve all the problems; the Republicans believe that Government was useless. And they were both too extreme, and the Americans were in the middle. But the real problem now is the Democrats have really moved a lot, and when we move this way the Republicans move this way.

But the real problem is, if we talk only in terms of programs and dollars, right, and they talk only in terms of the evils of Government and how the President is doing too much for them—[*inaudible*]*—both sides are letting the people off the hook. That's what—you go back and read Lincoln. You know, the people were always—he would never let the people off the hook. We were making choices.*

And Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, if you go back and read their speeches, there's a lot of that in there. And even when

FDR was railing against the trust and all the enemies that he'd created, he still in the Fireside Chats was always reminding people that they had things to do.

So what I try to do—even the speeches I gave in my fundraisers, which were not your traditional campaign speeches, is I'm trying to find ways to explain as best as I understand it what is happening to our people and trying to get us to make choices that are consistent with the new realities and the basic values that I believe we all have to hold. And it's a very exciting thing. And I'm also trying to tell the Democrats that they need to just relax and say what they believe and not worry about this debate—a lot of people are, you know—there are Members in the Republican House that say things like Medicare's the worst thing that happened to the sixties, Janet Reno ought to be indicted, and all this stuff. It's driving some of our people crazy. But what I'm trying to tell them is—and I'm trying to tell the Republicans the same thing—this debate had to come because of the transition period. And in a period like this, new things become possible which are good, but then things become thinkable which caused people to shudder for the same reason, because all the conventional wisdom breaks down and then you have to create a new one.

The Congress

Q. Why do you say the problem that Truman faced is the one you're facing? There were Republican Congresses both times, but that was a do-nothing Congress. This is sort of a do-too-much Congress in terms of activism. Do you draw—think the analogy—[*inaudible*]*—do you see that as a different—*

The President. But the difference is perception. The truth is the last Congress was not a do-nothing—you mean, Truman had a do-nothing Congress.

Q. Yes. But the current Congress is an activist Congress.

The President. Well, the House is an activist House. The Senate wants to be activist, but they're trying to find a more dynamic center that can be a bipartisan center. And the real interesting thing is whether the chemistry between the House, the Senate, and the President can lead to a creative kind

of tension that will move us forward. That's the argument I keep making to the Speaker, or the personal plea I made to Bob Dole on welfare reform, which, frankly, to which he responded and we worked through a lot of that stuff. A lot of those ideas that are in there, the giving States a bonus for putting people to work, requiring people to sign personal responsibility contracts, all those things are ideas we've been advocating for years. And I'm excited—I don't agree with everything in that Senate bill, but I'm excited about the direction it took, that it really is a new-ideas direction rooted in the idea of both work and family, which I think is—one of the central realities for you and for every other American is we have to create a country which you can succeed at work and at home. And if we get in a position where even the poorest among us have to choose, we're in deep trouble.

Welfare Reform

Q. Has Dole told you he thinks he can get most of that bill?

The President. No, he didn't say. But before he brought the bill up, we had a visit when he came to the White House one time, and I just told him that I would really go a long way to try to meet him in agreement and I thought that welfare reform had become a symbol for the country and I didn't want it to become a symbol of division because I didn't think we ought to kick poor people around and beat them up. But I did think it was bad to have a system of permanent dependency that was created for a different age. As Moynihan never tires of telling us, it was created for the West Virginia miner's widow, who had a fourth-grade education and kids at home and there wasn't any place in the work force for her anyway.

We live in a world now where work and family are merged much more clearly and which we cannot afford to have a whole class of our people in a state of permanent dependency. It draws upon their dignity; it's bad for their children. So welfare should be a temporary help to people in need.

So, anyway, that's a hopeful sign anyway. But we can do a lot of good for this country. We can balance the budget. We can strengthen the economy. We can maintain our com-

mitment to education and technology, which means people will be able to make more of their own lives and they'll have a stronger economy. We have to slow the rate of growth in Medicare and Medicaid—I don't disagree with all the specific Medicare reforms that have been advanced. Some of them are common to what I recommended in '94, if you go back to my health care plan. What I think is wrong is to jerk an arbitrary amount of money out of a health care system without considering what the consequences are.

I was in Orange County after I left the—you all were down there with me, but after I did the public deal, I went in and did a roundtable with business executives in Orange County and some education leaders. And most of them were Republicans. But I started a dialog with them in '92. Some of them supported me and some of them didn't, but I've kept up the dialog because there are a lot of forward-thinking people around there. And one man spoke up in this room; he said, "You know, nobody has talked about the impact of the Medicaid program, all these cuts, on the great teaching hospitals," that basically this is typical of the Democrats—it's a problem they solved a few years ago in an indirect way and they never thought to explain to America that, basically, Medicaid, because so many of the great teaching hospitals are located in and around cities with large numbers of poor people and because those teaching hospitals need patients, Medicaid funds have actually supported medical education in America and indirectly supported institutions of—[inaudible]—resource.

So he was telling me—now, one of the things we estimate is that California will rebound from the defense downsizing by having a huge advance in medical and biological sciences over the next 20 years as we move into the age—[inaudible]. And he said, "If we just arbitrarily take all this money out of the Medicaid system without really thinking about what it's going to do to these great centers of learning and research, it's a bad deal." So that's an issue that nobody has even thought about in the actual debate.

But the point is, we can work this out. We do have to slow the rate of—is this going to become another Washington paralysis, like

it was before I showed up? They fought about the crime bill for 6 years and fought about family aid for 7 years and fought about all this other—where each side can walk away and say, well, I tried, but the others were unreasonable. Or will we find a creative tension here which enables us to do—make real progress on all these—[inaudible]—so that we're throwing the country into the future but in a way that keeps us together and really preserves our obligations to our children, our parents, and our obligation to keep opportunity—[inaudible]?

It's going to be a very interesting 2 months.

Administration Accomplishments

Q. [Inaudible]

The President. Well, it did that. And also it came about because I realized that either—right before or right at the election there were a few sort of revisionist articles that came out in magazines saying, people think nothing has been done, but this Congress has given Bill Clinton 80 percent of his programs in 2 years, very ambitious programs; it's only the third time since World War II this has happened, and why don't they link it? Maybe they don't feel it. The Democrats govern better than they talk. Health care was a \$300 billion fight by those who were—so health care overshadowed everything else. There were all these reasons, but when you stripped it all away, I was doing all these things that 70 percent of the American people really agreed with when they heard about it, but it didn't connect in their lives and their minds. And a lot of them couldn't even receive it. A lot couldn't even receive it.

I'm going to tell you an interesting story. Mack McLarty—two stories. Mack McLarty spoke at the Perot convention for us, and basically—and I now think we took slightly the wrong tack there. But anyway—and there were some—a lot of them were Republican political people, but there were some real Perot people there, too. And so Mack talks to this—he's working the crowd after he talks. He basically said, we did 80 percent of what Ross Perot advocated in his book, and here's what he advocated and here's what we did and here's what we still have to do. So he talks his heart out, you know.

And this woman comes up to him—he's working the crowd—and this woman says, "You're a nice young man, and you're a very attractive, nice young man. But I don't agree with anything you and your President stand for." So he says, "What is it that you don't agree with? Do you disagree with the fact that we took the deficit from \$290 billion to \$160 billion?" She said, "Did you really do that?" He'd just spoken about that. He said, "Yes, we really did that, he talked about it." She said, "Well, I do agree with that." He said, "Well, what do you do?" She said, "I'm a retired schoolteacher." He said, "Do you have children?" She said, "One; my son works for Dupont"—or some company. I think it was Dupont; I can't remember. And he said, "You don't agree with NAFTA, do you?" He said, "You know, 30 percent of that company's profits last year came from trade with Mexico." She said, "Is that right?"

It was interesting. But the point is she literally could not hear him when he was standing up there talking to her because her resistance is to her preconceptions about Democrats and me and Government and Washington. She couldn't absorb it.

And a lot of you have heard me talk about my Cabinet member whose sister called her one day and said, "I'm so excited because my tax bill went down \$600"—or whatever it was. This woman was a working mother with two kids and a modest income. She said, "Yes, I know, that was a big part of the President's program." And she said, "No, it wasn't." She said, "What do you mean? I'm in the Cabinet, it was a big part of our program." She said, "All you do is defend him." She said, "He went around the table and made us all give up money to pay for that earned-income tax credit so people like you get a tax break." She said, "I watch the news every night; if anything that important had happened—that's the most important thing that's happened in years—I would know that if he had."

But you see, it was buried amidst all the bigger conflicts of the economic plan, just like the direct student loan program was, which is why they can never—[inaudible]. The point I want to make is what struck me is in a democracy it is not enough to do a lot of particular things that will make the gen-

eral points you're trying to make. Things are changing so much that a lot of what is unsettling is not so much in reality as it also is in people's heads. And it's very important that—I mean, the most important thing in a democracy is how—is not who happens to be President at one given moment, it is how the people understand their time, their obligations, and their opportunities.

Which is why I don't like the argument going on between the two parties, even though in specifics I normally agree with—I don't think we ought to frame it just in terms of we're for this much money and this program, and they say the Government—[*inaudible*]. What we really have to do is say, this is the change, this is what's happening in your life, and the money is incidental to the value choices you're making and the vision you have about the future. Don't kid yourself, this is a decision we're all making; these are changes we're all going through. You can't just blame somebody or drive a wedge through the country and expect us to get results. Neither will all your problems be solved if we win this money battle over this program.

And I just began to see that, and I realized that if you go back and read the really important things that Presidents said in history, very often what they tried to do is to explain to the American people that—[*inaudible*]—and how the American idea can be preserved and enhanced in that moment by taking a different course rooted in the basic things that have always been at the guts of this—[*inaudible*].

Q. [*Inaudible*]—modern Presidency people do—[*inaudible*]—because they see this on the TV—

Press Secretary Mike McCurry. Time out. This is good food for thought, but these guys need real food, too.

Information Age

Q. Lincoln—if he suggested the same kind of scrutiny that you are—[*inaudible*].

The President. Well, I think in the information age, too much exposure and too much information and too much sort of quasi-information—I mean, you guys have to compete with near-news, too. It's like when we were kids, we'd drink near-beer. You've got all this

information and a lot of competition among news sources, and then you're competing with the near-news. And there is a danger that too much stuff cramming in on people's lives is just as bad for them as too little in terms of the ability to understand, to comprehend.

Which is why, again I say, I underestimated in my first 2 years the importance of continually not just—even the town meetings, one of the problems is—like yesterday in the Larry King thing—I don't know if you listened to it—I thought it was good; I loved doing it, but I found myself about three questions in, I said, No, no, no, no, I'm doing too much of the details of the specific issue they're asking without trying to keep putting it in the larger context. Because we need to develop sort of a common understanding.

Now, people intuitively respond to that. When in Colin's book, he talks about the American family or if I talk about common ground or I say what it is that brings us together or Ross Perot says we shouldn't have politics or, you know, or when the leaders in the Congress make some outreach that they resonate to intuitively, but there's no sort of—well, what does that mean at this time, which is what I'm trying to do.

I had so many people on this trip, even at these fundraisers, come up to me and say that they were really glad they were there because they had been themselves trying to understand what was going on and make sense of it, to kind of incorporate it into their lives.

Colin Powell

Q. [*Inaudible*]—you have an autographed copy of General Powell's book tomorrow night when you see him?

The President. I certainly hope so. [*Laughter*]

Q. Are you looking forward to that? It will be the first time you will share the platform with—

Q. Is he going to be at the Congressional Black Caucus?

Q. Yes.

The President. Maybe I'll get my book. [*Laughter*]

Anyway, it's very—I'm also trying to get people to get out of their funk about it.

Mood of the Country

Q. Get out of their funk?

The President. Yes. Yes, because the truth is that we have proved that we can make this economy perform under these circumstances. But it used to be that a high-performance economy, a lot of entrepreneurs, a lot of new millionaires was inexorably—inevitably meant higher wages for everybody. It doesn't anymore. So we've got to go to the second problem. We've proved we can perform. We've proved we can make progress in social problems. I mean, it's—just last night on the news it said teen pregnancies down in America for the second year in a row. And you heard me—the divorce rate is down, food stamps, welfare, crime, murder. But the wrinkle on it is the teenager is still in trouble.

But we've proved—you know, 5 years ago most Americans basically thought the crime rate was going to go up forever. And you now know—so we can do things if we have the right understanding and we understand that we just have been given the gift or the burden of living through this time and we've just got to do our job.

I think it's really—it's quite exciting. But I believe, to go back to what you said, John, my own belief is that human beings, particularly the American people, are capable of enduring a lot of difficulty and a lot of tumult and upheaval if they understand it. What makes people insecure is when they feel like they're lost in the funhouse. They're in a room where something can hit them from any direction any time. They always feel living life is like walking across a running river on slippery rocks and you can lose your footing at any time.

If people kind of—if you understand what's happening to you, you can make the necessary—not just changes but necessary psychological adaptations. So you define security in a different way, and you can rear back and go on then. So that—I find it—and I really feel that this is important for me to do.

President Ronald Reagan

Q. [Inaudible]—in California what do you hear about President Reagan? I understand it was possible you might visit him, but he

is in pretty bad shape. Have you heard any word on him lately?

The President. I called Mrs. Reagan some—a couple months ago, I guess. I haven't heard anything since then.

Mood of the Country

Q. On what we were talking about, do you feel after this trip that you found the words that can explain the time to people, or are you still searching for it?

The President. Yes, but I can't do it in 30 seconds.

Q. But when you talk about getting people out of their funk, there was this period where you were so—consistently reported—a long time ago now, but to be in one yourself. Are you long since out of it, and is this part of why?

The President. Oh, yes. Yes. But what bothered—I don't mind adversity. I have difficulty when I—I don't think I can do my job as President if I don't understand what's happening. And I really spent a lot of time trying to understand what was going on, and I really think what I said is true. I think that I and all of us had underestimated the dimensions of the changes and the challenges facing us. And so now I feel quite good about it.

Q. [Inaudible]—30 seconds in this day and age?

The President. I'll—eventually, I'll get it in 30 seconds. I'll be able to do it in 30 seconds, in a minute, 2 minutes, 5 minutes, and 30 minutes. It's what you've got to do. You need to—if you can go 30 minutes down, you know.

President's Schedule

Q. It's a long way to November in 1996—

Press Secretary McCurry. I get the last question. These guys—you've had so much energy this week, they all want to know are you going to try to keep this same pace all the way through to November of 1996.

The President. No. [Laughter]

Q. Can you tell us how to get by on 4 hours sleep a night? Are there things you learned in Oxford or—

The President. I never slept—I slept more than 4 hours every night we were gone.

I never slept less than 5 hours. But except that night we were in Denver—I slept 6 hours, but it was 2 and 4.

Q. Not continuous.

The President. Two and 4. So it was tough. When I have a difficult day like that, particularly if I can't exercise, I try to drink lots and lots and lots of water. I try to make an extra effort to concentrate on what other people are saying, to listen——

Q. —— don't fall asleep.

Q. Good advice to us.

The President. Well, so you don't fall asleep—not fall asleep, but just don't get blah, you know.

Q. Mr. President, when you run at 7 a.m. it means that we have to run at 5:30 a.m. [Laughter] Seriously. When you run at 7 a.m., I have to get up and run at 5:30 a.m. to catch the pool for you running.

The President. Why couldn't you make a deal with the pool that you could be the designated runner, then you could run at 7 a.m.

Q. Believe me, that would be the most popular innovation you could make.

Q. Hey, I'll take pool duty.

The President. I would love to have the pool run with me, any day.

Q. They should. I'm not sure Lew Merletti would love it, but I mean——

The President. Oh, no, it would be fine.

Q. Because that's what the public thinks. They think jogging with the President is running alongside of him. They don't think it's the 10th and 11th cars in a 12-car motorcade, passing beside him around the corner.

The President. The Secret Service would not care if anybody in the pool wanted to run with me.

Press Secretary McCurry. That's not the—the problem is, have you ever had Helen Thomas [United Press International] sit in your office at 7 a.m. in the morning? [Laughter] That's what I do every morning. Now, it's like a running press conference.

The President. No, I couldn't talk while I was running.

Q. We couldn't either, believe you me.

The President. I laid off for a couple of months. And one of the things I always have to do when I start running again, particularly the older I get and the harder it gets, is con-

centrate real hard on my breathing patterns. Because most people can run a lot more than they think; it's their breathing that gives out. They get into irregular breathing, and they start gasping instead of pushing out. So I can't—when I get in real good shape again I can talk when I'm running. But right now I can only concentrate on——

Q. Why did you lay off? Had you had a sprain or a strain or just——

The President. Well, this summer, the heat and allergies bothered me. So I just worked out. And then when I went to—by the time I got on vacation I was as tired as I've ever been in my life, I think. And I just didn't want to do it. I just wanted to lay around my family or fool around on the golf course or go climb mountains if you're going to do it. I just didn't want to do it.

Press Secretary McCurry. Let's let these guys have dinner.

Q. Thank you, sir.

Q. I was going to ask, can you come back again and say hello to——

The President. Thanks, guys.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 7:30 p.m. while en route from San Diego, CA, to Washington, DC. In his remarks, the President referred to Bertha Pendleton, superintendent, San Diego Unified School District and the late Samuel M. Walton, founder, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on the Tragedy at Elmendorf Air Force Base in Alaska September 22, 1995

Hillary and I were very saddened to learn of the death of the American and Canadian service members in the crash of a U.S. Air Force AWACS aircraft at Elmendorf Air Force Base in Alaska this morning. Their loss reminds us how much we owe those who serve our Nation's Armed Forces. Our hearts and prayers go out to the families, friends, and loved ones of those who were killed, both in the United States and in Canada.

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address*September 23, 1995*

Good morning. I want to talk to you today about the prospects for peace in Bosnia. Over the past weeks, American leadership and the determination demonstrated by NATO and the United Nations have helped to bring Bosnia closer to peace than at any time since the war began there 4 years ago. Let me be clear: There are many tough obstacles still to overcome, but we are determined to press forward for a lasting peaceful settlement.

At the end of the cold war, Serbian nationalism forced the breakup of Yugoslavia. An ugly and dangerous war broke out in the heart of Europe, risking an even wider conflict in the Balkans which could have drawn the United States and many other countries in. Bosnia, a land in which Muslims, Serbs, and Croats had lived together peacefully for centuries, was literally torn apart.

As President, I have worked to do everything in our power to support the search for peace in Bosnia, to stop the conflict from spreading beyond its borders, and to ease the terrible suffering of the Bosnian people. We can't force peace on the parties; only they themselves can make it. That's why I have refused to let American ground troops become combatants in Bosnia. But we can press the parties to resolve their differences at the bargaining table and not on the battlefield. We will spare no effort to find a peaceful solution, and we will work through NATO to implement a settlement once the parties reach it.

Working closely with our partners from Europe and Russia, last year we proposed a peace plan that would preserve Bosnia as a state with Bosnia's Muslims and Croats holding 51 percent of the land and 49 percent going to the Bosnian Serbs. The Muslims and the Croats accepted our plan. But the Bosnian Serbs did not. Instead, they laid siege to Sarajevo and the other U.N.-declared safe areas, denying food, denying medicine, denying supplies to innocent civilians. They continued to make war. They refused to make peace.

This July, as the Serbs continue their assaults against the safe areas, America pressed NATO and the U.N. to take a tougher stand,

and our allies agreed. When a Bosnian Serb shell slaughtered 38 people in Sarajevo just 3 weeks ago, we insisted that NATO and the U.N. make good on their commitment to protect Sarajevo and the other safe areas from further attacks. We demanded that the Serbs stop offensive actions against the safe areas, withdraw their heavy weapons from around Sarajevo, and allow road and air access to the city. When they refused, NATO began heavy and continuous air strikes against Bosnian Serb military targets.

These NATO air strikes, many, many of them flown by courageous American pilots and crews, convinced the Bosnian Serbs to comply with our demands. They stopped shelling Sarajevo. They moved their heavy weapons away from Sarajevo. They opened the roads and the airports to convoys carrying food and medicine and other supplies.

I salute our pilots and crews and their NATO colleagues. Because they did their job so well, today the people of Sarajevo can walk the streets of their city more free from fear than at any time in many months. And I want to make absolutely clear that if the Bosnian Serbs strike again at Sarajevo or the other safe areas, NATO's air strikes will resume.

Over the past weeks I also ordered our negotiators to step up their efforts to get the parties back to the peace negotiating table and to respond to shifting military circumstances in Bosnia where Croatian and Bosnian Government forces have made significant gains. The negotiators shuttled throughout the region, and they brought forth the Foreign Ministers of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia together in Geneva. Their hard work got the Serbs to agree to the principles of our peace plan. Thanks to the combination of military muscle and diplomatic determination, there is now a real chance for peace in Bosnia. We must seize it.

I have instructed our negotiating team to go to New York on Tuesday to meet with the Foreign Ministers of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia and our allies to push the peace process forward. Then I've asked them to return to the region to continue their intensive shuttle diplomacy and to keep the parties focused on an overall settlement. As I have said, there's no guarantee that we can reach a settlement. There are still deep, deep divisions

among the parties. But there has been genuine progress.

What's happening today in Bosnia demonstrates once again the importance of American leadership around the world at the end of the cold war. Just think of the extraordinary achievements of the past year: democracy restored to Haiti, greater peace in the Middle East and in Northern Ireland, Russian nuclear weapons no longer aimed at our people, the indefinite extension of a nuclear nonproliferation treaty, real progress toward a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, North Korea's agreement to end its nuclear weapons program. Each one of these is a product of American leadership. In the new and changing world we live in, America is the one country that can nearly always make a difference.

But if we want to continue to make a difference, if we want to continue to lead, we must have the resources that leadership requires. I intend to do everything in my power to make sure our military remains the best fighting force in the world and that our diplomats have the tools they need to help those who are taking risks for peace. We must not let our foreign policy and America's place in the world fall victim to partisan politics or petty fights. Every American, Democrats, Republicans, independents, all of us, should agree on the need for America to keep leading around the world.

That is the lesson of the progress we're seeing in Bosnia. That's the lesson of the foreign policy actions we've taken over the last year, actions that have made the world a safer place and every American more secure.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE. The address was recorded at 1:35 p.m. on September 22 at the Tustin Officers' Club in Tustin, CA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on September 23.

Remarks at the Congressional Black Caucus Dinner

September 23, 1994

Thank you very much, Congressman Jefferson, for chairing this dinner and for being my longtime friend. He has such a nice name: William Jefferson. [Laughter] One day

we were on a platform together in Louisiana, and we both kind of got to ventilating, and he said after I spoke, "It's a good thing you've got a last name or no one could tell us apart." [Laughter]

Congressman Payne, the CBC Chair; Cardiss Collins, the Foundation Chair; to all the distinguished awardees, General Powell, Congressman Lewis, Muhammed Ali, Congressman Ford, Renee Gaters, all very deserving; Ms. Gaters for your charity and your generosity over so many years; my longtime friend John Lewis for being a living reminder of what it means to live by what you say you believe; my friend Congressman Ford, who was working on welfare reform before the other crowd knew what it was. I thank you, sir.

Of course, one of your recipients has been on the front page of every magazine in this country, deluged with TV and radio requests, written a book, and has a name and face instantly recognized all around the world. I'm honored to share the spotlight tonight with Muhammed Ali and with General Colin Powell. [Applause] Thank you.

There are many things to be said about Colin Powell's lifetime of service to our country and service to three Presidents on matters on national security, but I know he is being honored tonight in large measure because just a year ago this week, he played an important part in our successful effort to end Haiti's long night of terror. Because of America's leadership, backing sanctions and diplomacy with force, because of the courage of President Aristide and the Haitian people and the support they received from so many of you in this room, today Haiti has its best chance in generations to build a strong democracy and to tackle the poverty that has been a scourge to those good people for too long.

In this great drama, General Powell answered my call to service. And along with President Carter and Senator Sam Nunn, he made sure the Haitian dictators understood the message of the United States that they had just one last chance to leave peacefully or suffer the consequences of being removed by military force. In no small measure because Colin Powell delivered that message so graphically, democracy was restored mi-

raculously without the loss of a single American life or a single Haitian life.

Tonight is special for all of us because it's the 25th anniversary of the Congressional Black Caucus, now 40-strong. I think that we should pay special tribute to the founding members here tonight, and especially to the five who are still serving: Louis Stokes, Ron Dellums, Bill Clay, John Conyers, and Charlie Rangel. And let me say that after watching that film and after watching Charlie Rangel stand up for the rights of poor children and elderly Americans just the other day, I feel confident that they've still got a lot of juice, a lot of energy, a lot of good ideas, and a lot to give this country.

I don't know where our country would be today without the Congressional Black Caucus. I want to thank you, all of you, for standing up for the values we all hold dear; for freedom and for responsibility; for work and for family; for the idea that we are, as my friend the Governor of Florida said the other day, a community, not a crowd. A crowd is a collection of people occupying the same space, elbowing one another until the strongest and most powerful win without regard to what happens to the others. A community is a group of people who occupy the same space and believe they're going up or down together, and they have responsibilities to one another. A community is a group of people led by people who do what's right for the long run, even if it defies the conventional wisdom and is unpopular in the short run. The Congressional Black Caucus has helped to keep America a community. Thank you, and God bless you all.

I have special reasons to be grateful to the Black Caucus. When I became President, we had a stagnant and suffering economy. The Congressional Black Caucus supported an economic policy that in 2½ years has produced 7½ million new jobs, 2½ million new homeowners, 2 million new small businesses, the largest number of new self-made millionaires in any time period in the history of the country, and an African-American unemployment rate back down in single digits for the first time since the Vietnam war. Thank you for doing that.

Three years ago, most Americans despaired that anything could ever be done

about crime. Acting on old values and embracing new ideas, the Congressional Black Caucus played an active role in shaping a crime bill that had people and punishment and prevention. It put more police officers on our streets, punished people who should be, but gave our people something to say yes to, some opportunities to live positive, good, constructive lives, and to know they were important to someone else. And because of that, in every State in this country and in almost every major urban area, the crime rate is down, the murder rate is down, and people believe we can make a difference. And I thank you for that.

Because you supported the policies of this administration to advance peace and freedom and democracy, from the Middle East to Northern Ireland to Russia and the other places of the former Soviet Union, there are no missiles pointed at the people of the United States tonight for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age. Peace is making progress in the Middle East and in Northern Ireland; democracy was restored to Haiti; we have supported South Africa, all because of people like you who made it possible. You have been a steadfast partner in standing up for America's best interests and America's best values.

I want to say a special word of thanks to you for the crucial role you have played in expanding freedom and opportunity in Africa. Today, two-thirds of the nations of Africa are moving toward democracy and market opportunities, with the help of American leadership and American assistance. Whether we supported historic elections in South Africa and Mozambique, provided dramatic humanitarian relief in Rwanda, assisted in the opening of stock markets in Botswana and Namibia, the United States has been committed to making a difference in Africa. Much remains to be done, fostering peace in Liberia and Angola, standing up for democracy in Nigeria. But with your help, America can remain a force for progress.

And in this debate on the budget, I implore you to remind the other Members of the Congress that we must remain a force for democracy and progress, not only in Africa but throughout the world. We cannot walk

away from people who look to us for support and encouragement.

But this is still a difficult and unsettling time. In each area I mentioned, you could have said, "I heard what you said, Mr. President, but—" For example, if I had told you 30 months ago that this country could produce 7½ million jobs, 2½ million homeowners, 2 million entrepreneurs, a 4,700 stock market, the largest number of self-made millionaires in history, but the average wage of the person in the middle would go down, not up, it would have been hard to believe, but it happened.

We can say all we want that the crime rate is down, the murder rate is down, the number of people on welfare and food stamps are down. The teen pregnancy rate is down. The drug use rate among people between 18 and 34 is down. But the rate of violent crime, death, and casual drug use among our teenagers is still going up.

We can say all we want about all the peace and prosperity that is coming to the world and how democracy is sweeping the world, but in every country, forces of extremism have a stronger voice than they have had in years. And organized groups, committed to destruction, based on racial or ethnic or religious or political extremism, have enormous capacity to do that destruction. You see it in a school bus blowing up in the Middle East. You see it when a fanatic breaks open a little vial of sarin gas in a subway in Japan. You see it in a bomb blowing up the Federal building in Oklahoma City.

And you see it in more subtle ways, yes, even in America. Like when five children in an upper class suburb in this country write the hated word "nigger" in code word in their school album. What is going on here? How do we account for all the good things and all the bad things that are happening at the same time?

I've spent a lot of time thinking about this, and since last November, I've had a little more time to think about it. I believe with all my heart when the history of this era is written and people look back on it, they will say that this was the most profound period of change in the way the American people live and work and relate to the rest of the world in a hundred years.

One hundred years ago, most of our forebears lived out in the country or in little towns. Most of us farmed the land or made a living because other people were farming the land. Then we began to move to cities, and we became an industrial country. A hundred years ago, we were keeping to ourselves, but within 20 years we had to get into World War I so that the forces of freedom could win. And we began to assert national leadership.

Now, we're moving away from this industrial age to an age characterized by information and technology, where people will soon be able to do most of the work they do wherever they want to live—in a city or in an isolated place in the mountains somewhere. We are moving from a cold war in which nation states look at each other across a great divide but still are able to provide most of people's needs, to a global economy where there's a lot of integration economically but a lot of pressures of disintegration on ordinary working people everywhere.

And what we have to do is to try to understand this time in which we live, embrace the new ideas that we need to embrace to preserve our vision of the future, which has to be rooted in the values for which you have always stood.

Don't you want a 21st century in which America is the leading opportunity society: growing entrepreneurs, growing the middle class, shrinking the under class; where everybody has a chance to live up to their God-given ability; where families and communities have a chance to solve their own problems; where the streets are safe and the schools are good and we have a clean environment and a strong health care system; and where we're still a force for peace and freedom in the world? I think that's what most of us want.

To get it, we need new ideas. We need a devotion to our old-fashioned values. We need to stop looking for ways to be divided and instead seeking common ground and higher ground. And we've got to be prepared to stand up for the future, even if it's not popular in the present. That's what this budget debate is all about. It's really not about money and programs; it's about what kind of people we're going to be. What are we

going to look like in the 21st century? What are we going to look like? What are our obligations to each other? If we're a community and not a crowd, what kind of obligations do we have to our parents and to our children, to those who aren't as well off as we are, to those who through no fault of their own are not doing so well, to people all around the world who look to us for leadership? What are our obligations?

I agree with the leadership of the Republican majority in Congress that we ought to balance the budget. We never had a permanent structural deficit until about 12 years before I showed up. And to be fair to the caucus—again, this defies conventional wisdom—but the plain truth is that in the previous 12 years, in every year but one, the Congress appropriated less money than the executive branch asked for. But we wound up quadrupling the debt.

Next year, if we don't do something about it, interest rates—interest payments on the debt will be bigger than the defense budget. But we have begun, you and I, to do something about it because this year the budget would be in balance but for the interest we're paying on those 12 years. The deficit was \$290 billion when we started; it's down to \$160 billion now. And that's not bad, a 40 percent cut in 3 years, for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

But why are we going to do this? Why should we balance the budget anyway? Because we believe it will take debt off our kids. Because we believe it will lower interest rates and free up money for the entrepreneurs who are here to borrow more money and put more people to work and make America stronger. Because we think it will fulfill our vision of the future. Therefore, when we do it, we have to do it in a way that supports that vision, otherwise there's no point in doing it in the first place. It is where we want to go that matters.

So I say to you, we ought to do this. But we ought to do it in a way that is consistent with our values, maintaining our investments in the things that make us strong, keeping our commitments as a community. That's what we have to do.

The proposal I put forward balances the budget but increases our investment in edu-

cation. We will never stop the decline in learning until we give lifetime educational opportunities to every person in this country no matter what their race, no matter what their income, no matter what their background. We will never do it.

We ought to secure the Medicare Trust Fund, but we can do that without breaking our contract with the elderly of this country. Three-quarters of them live on less than \$24,000 a year. It's pretty hard to charge them several hundred dollars more a year for what they thought was already going to be paid for.

Now, let me just say that a lot of the things that I believed when I showed up here, I thought were matters of bipartisan consensus, are almost nonpartisan. When a country goes through a great period of change, it is important that people try to join hands on those things that are critical to its security and its character. That's what we did in the cold war. I think education is an important part of our security. I think growing the middle class and shrinking the under class is an important part of our security. I think reminding us, ourselves, that in the global economy of the 21st century our racial diversity is our great meal ticket to the future if we can all figure out how to get along and how to lift each other up. That's a part of our security. And we ought to treat it that way.

So I say, balance the budget, but don't deprive hundreds of thousands of young kids of a chance to get off to a good start in school. Don't deprive schools that happen to be poor of the chance to have smaller classes or computers in the classroom or high standards and high expectations, or just the chance to be safe and drug-free. Don't raise the cost of going to college at a time when it's more important to go to college than ever before just because the people that used to make a lot of money out of the student loan program aren't making it anymore. Don't do that.

I want to emphasize this: My goal is to see every young person in this country get out of high school and get at least, at least 2 years of further education. That's my goal. That ought to be your goal. That's what the economy tells us has to be everybody's goal.

And yet today, because of the rising cost of college, enrollment is already dropping for poor people and, therefore, disproportionately for minorities. And if you don't believe it's a problem, just look at California. They've been through such wrenching problems that the cost of education has gone up almost 20 percent and enrollment has dropped 10 percent. And when a State's in trouble, you need more people going, not fewer. This is a big deal, and we don't have to do it to balance the budget.

I believe, as all of you know, in reforming the welfare system but not as a way of dividing the American people but as a way of liberating people who are trapped in the system. Most people in this country work. Most parents work. So it's not unreasonable to say most people who have children who happen to be on welfare should move toward work.

But what we want in America is for every parent to be able to succeed at home and, if they must work, at work as well. We don't need to tear people down; we need to lift people up. Most people who are poor and on welfare would give anything in the world to be somewhere else doing something else. We ought to help them do it. And we ought to help them succeed as parents and workers.

We say—everybody says—if you took a poll in the Congress on Monday morning, “Everybody that does not believe in work, please stand up.” Nobody would stand. “Everybody that believes we ought to encourage welfare over work, please stand up.” Nobody would stand. But their budget proposal proposes to cut taxes for nearly everybody in America, including upper income people like me that don't ask for it and don't want it and sure don't need it. General Powell is about to move into that category—[laughter]—with his book.

They propose that, but you know what? They want to raise taxes on some Americans. The 14 million working families that we lowered taxes on in 1993, who are working full-time, have children in the homes, barely have enough to get by, the Congressional Black Caucus voted to lower their taxes. Now this congressional proposal is to raise their taxes by \$40 billion. This is wrong. Ronald Reagan said that the earned-income credit for working families was the best anti-poverty pro-

gram in history because it rewarded work. We increased it so dramatically that it was the biggest effort to lift the incomes of low-income working people and to equalize the middle class in America in 20 years. And now, while everybody else's taxes are being cut, those people's taxes are going to be raised by people who say they want to get people off welfare and into work. That is wrong. It violates our values. It's not about money; it's about families and rewarding work and standing up for what's right.

Medicare, Medicaid—for 3 years we said that health care costs were growing too fast; they had to be slowed down. The Congressional Black Caucus, with no help from members of the other party, added 3 years to the life of the Medicare Trust Fund when nobody was looking and some were denying it was there. Now, the Medicare trustees say we need to add more life to it, and it costs \$90 billion to \$100 billion to do it. I offered a balanced budget plan to do it, to save the Trust Fund, and add a decade of life.

Under the guise of saving the trust fund and balancing the budget, they propose to take 3 times that much out of Medicare and so much out of Medicaid that it will endanger the life of urban hospitals and rural hospitals, elderly people in nursing homes and getting care in their home, and the health care of all the poor children in the country, who through no fault of their own are poor.

And so I say to you, let's save the Medicare Trust Fund. Let's slow the rate of growth in inflation in Medicare and Medicaid. But let's don't pretend that we can just jerk \$450 billion out of health care system of America without hurting anybody and that we can do it without absolutely ignoring our obligations to our parents and our grandparents and to the children of this country. It is wrong. We should not do it. We can balance the budget without doing it. And we should listen to those who tell us that.

Let me just say one last thing about crime. Earlier this week I had the privilege of going to Jacksonville, Florida. Jacksonville, as a united city and county government—got some people clapping back there. It's a county that normally votes Republican, and increasingly so. But they elected an African-American Democrat sheriff. Why? Because

he promised to make his office the streets. Because he promised to put law enforcement officers on the streets in the neighborhood. Because he promised to make the safety of all the people in the county his first priority. And within 6 months the crime rate had gone down 9 percent, in only 6 months. And he was there with me expressing his thanks to you through me for the crime bill and the 100,000 police officers it put on the street.

The Attorney General was there with me. We had all the children from the community there. We were in a poor neighborhood. We walked the streets talking to these people who said nobody ever paid any attention to their safety before, and they were so glad to see that they could have law enforcement officers on the street.

So this sheriff stood up and said, "This is working. The crime rate's going down." The Congress should not abolish the national commitment to 100,000 police and say that they're going to meet it in some other way by cutting the money they're giving and writing a blank check to local governments or to the State. It'll never happen.

Now, out there in the country, fighting crime is a bipartisan issue. There is no constituency anywhere in America for raising the crime rate with the possible exception of Washington, DC, and this debate that's going on over the crime bill here. That also is not necessary to balance the budget, and it is wrong.

Let me just say one last thing to you about all this. Nobody knows how this is going to come out. So I've got a suggestion. We're in a 100-year period of change. You and I can no more calculate what will be popular next week or next month than a man in the Moon. In 1992, I wasn't smart enough to figure this out back then; I thought it had something to do with my ability. But in 1992, when I was nominated, on June the 2d, I was in third place in the polls. Six weeks later, I was in first place in the polls. Who could have predicted that? Nobody.

It is idle speculation. We have to now go back in these next 2 months and tell people with whom we disagree, "Look, we want to find common ground. But we have to balance the budget in a way that is consistent with our vision. And we may have to do some

things that are unpopular just because you think they're going to be right over the long run."

You know, two-thirds of the American people thought I was wrong in Haiti, but I'm glad I did it. And I think history will prove us right.

And a lot of you caucus members will have to say you lost some good colleagues out of the Congress because we voted for the Brady bill, and we voted for the assault weapons ban. But you know, last year alone over 40,000 people with criminal records were unable to get handguns. And if we just take a few Uzis off the streets and out of the schools and we have a few fewer kids being shot dead standing by bus stops, having their lives robbed from them, it is worth the political price. They said, "Don't you do it," but it was worth it. We did the right thing. We did the right thing.

A few weeks ago we were trying to decide how to handle the studies of the FDA on teenage smoking. And every political adviser I had in and out of the White House said, "You can do this if you want to, but it's terrible politics, because the tobacco companies will get you. And they'll terrify all those good country tobacco farmers that are good, decent people. They work hard, but they can be scared to death. And then they'll wipe out—they'll vote against anybody in your party. And all the Americans that agree with you will find some other reason to vote against you, but they will stay against you. So don't you be the first person in office to take them on. You were already the first person in office to take the NRA on—don't do that."

But the research showed that for 30 years some of those folks were aware of the danger of tobacco. And the evidence showed that there is still targeted efforts to advertise to teenagers, even though it's illegal for children to smoke in every State in the country. And most important of all, the evidence showed that 3,000 young people a day start to smoke. And 1,000 of them will end their lives early. And if it saves a thousands lives a day for longer, fuller, better lives, then who cares what the consequences are? Twenty years from now in the 21st century, people will say they did what was right. And that is ex-

actly what we ought to do on every single issue.

Finally, I thank Bill Jefferson for what he said about affirmative action. We reviewed every one of those programs. We looked at them all. I argued it nine ways from Sunday. It was obvious that the politics was one place and the merits were somewhere else. It's obvious that a lot of people in our country feel anxiety-ridden about the economy. And the easy answer is, "There's nothing wrong with you; you don't have to change in this time of change; we just need to get rid of the Government; and they're spending all their money on affirmative action, welfare," you know, whatever that list is.

That was the easy answer, but it's the wrong answer, not because all those programs are perfect, not because they don't need to be changed, but because in the heart of America we still—we still are not able to make all of our decisions without regard to race or gender. We ought to be able to. I pray to God someday we will. But you know it, and I know it: We still need to make a conscious effort to make sure that we get the most of every American's ability and we give every American a fair shot. That's what this is all about.

And I will say again, if it were not for our racial diversity, we wouldn't be as well positioned as we are for the 21st century. I know that it makes a difference in the administration that we have people like Ron Brown and Lee Brown and Jesse Brown and Hazel O'Leary. And I'll tell you something else, Mike Espy was the best Agriculture Secretary in 25 years. It makes a difference that we have people like Deval Patrick and Rodney Slater and Jim Joseph, who's going to be the Ambassador to South Africa. That makes a difference to how America works. Alexis Herman and Bob Nash and Maggie Williams and others make a difference in the White House. It makes a difference.

I was so attacked by the conventional wisdom for being committed to diversity. But after nearly 3 years, we're appointing Federal judges at a more rapid rate than the previous administration. We have appointed more African-Americans than the last three administrations combined. And according to the American Bar Association, they have the

highest qualified ratings in the last 20 years. So I don't want to hear that you can't have excellence and equal opportunity at the same time. You can, we must, and we will.

Let me say that there is a lot of talk about personal responsibility. What we have to do is practice it. There's a lot of talk about valuing family and work and community. What we have to do is value them.

Let me close by talking about one particular American citizen that I think would be a pretty good role model for the President, the Speaker, the Senate Majority Leader, the Congressional Black Caucus, and everybody else that's going to be making decisions about America's future in the next 60 days. I got permission from my wonderful wife tonight to have a date with another woman to the Congressional Black Caucus. Her name is Oseola McCarty.

At the young age of 87, she is a stellar example of what it means to live a life of dignity, service, values, and personal responsibility. Before today she had never been to Washington. She had never flown on an airplane, and when I invited her to do it, she said she'd like to come see me, but not if she had to get on an airplane. [*Laughter*] So Oseola has come all the way from Hattiesburg, Mississippi, by train.

You may have read about her in the last few weeks. A lot of people talk about the dignity of work, but from the time before she was a teenager, she worked all her life washing clothes for people. She started out charging \$1.50 to \$2.00 a bundle. She lived modestly and was able to accumulate savings over the years. In fact, while she earned what by any stretch of the imagination was a very meager income, she saved such an enormous percentage of what she earned, and she and her local banker invested it so well that she amassed a sizable sum. Last month, after a lifetime of work, this woman who did that job for decades and decades and decades quietly and with dignity and with excellence donated \$150,000 to the University of Southern Mississippi for scholarships for African-American students.

When people ask her why in the world she did this, she said, "I just want the scholarship to go to some child who needs it, to whoever's not able to help their children. I'm

too old to get an education, but they can.” Well, the University has already given \$1,000 scholarship in her name to an 18-year-old graduate of Hattiesburg High School named Stephanie Bullock. Someday Stephanie Bullock may be a lawyer, a doctor, perhaps a member of the Congressional Black Caucus because of Oseola McCarty.

Our country needs more people like her, people who don’t just talk about responsibility and community but who live those values. I’m proud that she’s my guest tonight. Before we came over, I brought her into the Oval Office and awarded her the Presidential Citizens Medal for her extraordinary act of generosity.

I’d like to ask her to come up here so you can all get a good look at her. *[Applause]*

I want to make you a promise, and I want to issue a challenge. My promise to you is that in the next few weeks when we make decisions that will shape the future of our great country into the 21st century, I’ll try to keep her example in mind. And my challenge is that everyone else do the same. If we do, this great country is going to do just fine.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:24 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the Washington Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to former boxing champion Muhammed Ali and civil rights attorney Renee Gaters.

Remarks Prior to Departure From Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland

September 24, 1995

Middle East Peace Process

The President. Good morning. Not long ago, Israel and the Palestinians announced that they have reached a full agreement on implementing the next phase of the Declaration of Principles. This is a big step on the road to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. And on behalf of the American people, I want to congratulate the negotiators and their leaders who continue to work and persevere and to prevail over the enemies of peace, including some who are willing to use terror to try to derail the peace process.

At the request of the parties, I have gladly agreed to host a signing ceremony at the White House on September the 28th. We will also be inviting other regional leaders and, obviously, other interested parties who have to be involved in this—entire venture a success. But this is a good day for peace in the Middle East and a good omen for good steps in the future.

Q. What do you think the impact will be on the hope for a comprehensive Middle East peace between Israel and all of its Arab neighbors?

The President. I don’t think it can be anything but positive. But we’ve learned from experience to take these things one at a time and to hammer out step-by-step progress and not to read too much into it. But I feel quite good about this; this is a major step. And as you know from your own observations, they have worked very hard over some very contentious issues that were quite difficult and complex. And I’ve been encouraged by what I’ve heard this morning about the progress that’s been made.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:52 a.m. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on Arrival in Avoca, Pennsylvania

September 24, 1995

Thank you very much. Good morning, and thank you for coming out. I want to say, first of all, how very much I appreciate the kindness that so many of you have shown to my wife and to the members of our family. And if we ever cause an interruption in ordinary flow of life here when the Rodham family comes back to its roots, I apologize for that. But you can’t imagine how much they all love it.

We’re going back to Lake Winola today for the first time since our daughter was not quite 2 years old. So she doesn’t have much of a memory of the first time we took her up there. We were talking about that this morning, getting ready to come up here.

Let me also give you a little good news. I’m sorry we’re a few minutes late this morn-

ing, but I got up early this morning at the White House and was on the phone for a couple of hours because this morning, or morning our time, not very long ago, the Israelis and the Palestinians have reached agreement on the next phase of their peace process. It's a big step forward toward ending the long, long state of siege in the Middle East. And on this day of worship, a thanksgiving for so many of us, I thought that would be a good way to get this Sunday off to the right kind of start.

I want to thank you also for the support that you have given to me and to our administration. We are doing everything we possibly can to try to lift up the values of work and family and freedom and responsibility and community in this country, to move the economy forward, to tackle the tough problems, and to bring the American people together.

And I am gratified that with all of our difficulties, we see the unemployment rate dropping, more jobs being created. The crime rate, believe it or not, now is going down in all 50 States. And we seem to be coming together again as a country and looking toward the future again.

And so I want to say that, for me at least, every day is an enormous opportunity as we go through this period of historic change for America's economy and in the whole world, to try to elevate the things that all of you live by day-in and day-out here, to try to restore economic opportunity where it was taken away in the 1980's, and to try to give people the opportunity to make the most of their own lives, and families and communities the chance to solve their own problems and realize their own possibilities. It is a great honor, a great joy. And for every day you have given me to be your President, I thank you.

God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 10:55 a.m. at Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International Airport. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks in a Question-and-Answer Session at the Godfrey Sperling Luncheon

September 25, 1995

Godfrey Sperling. Well, Mr. President, what can I say, except it's wonderful to be over here. And as I've said before, in other times we've been at the White House, we'd love to have our breakfasts or lunches over here, maybe every week or two, maybe Mike could work it out. [Laughter] But having said all that, we can get started. I hate to ask the President to sit down, but—[laughter]—

The President. Please, be seated, everyone.

Mr. Sperling. —that's what we do. Our ground rules—you've been to our breakfast before and lunch, whatever we want to call this today, and you know the ground rules, everything's on the record. And you've seen this bunch of rascals before, at least a few of them. And they haven't changed, they're the same ones that you've seen in the past. So I'm giving you a little warning.

So you all know, I understand there will be transcripts of this later in the afternoon. And beyond that, I just have to say welcome to you and thank you so much for coming to my 80th birthday.

The President. I'm glad to have you here. I would like to say just to begin that the Vice President and I are delighted to have you and your family here. It's a special day. Someone told me that you had done 2,800 of these now. And—

Mr. Sperling. Almost.

The President. I was trying to think of the significance of them. One of them is that I noticed from the breakfasts that I've been to, they are notoriously high cholesterol. And so you are—you're very aging condition is a stunning rebuke to all of those who advocate healthy eating. [Laughter]

Mr. Sperling. I stay away from it.

The President. I don't know what the consequences of all that are, but it's a remarkable thing.

Let me also say, as you know, this is going to be a busy week around here. And you may

have heard already, but in case you haven't, not too long ago, this morning, the Bosnian Government announced that they would participate in the resumption of the peace talks tomorrow in New York, which is very good news. And we do have the best chance we've had, I think, since the beginning of the conflict now to have a peace agreement come out of this. And of course, later in the week we'll have the signing here of the agreement between the Palestinians and the Israelis in the next phase of the peace agreement there.

So I'm very encouraged. I think both these things are examples of the imperative for United States leadership. And I think the world's better off because of what's happened in the last couple of years. And of course, there are a lot of things at issue there, which you might want to ask about. But I don't want to take up any more of your time.

Mood of the Country

Mr. Sperling. Well, since I own the football, I usually ask the first question. You know, I was feeling quite perky over the weekend, Mr. President, with my birthday coming up and everything. And then I read in the papers, you know, we all were in a deep blue funk. And I just have to ask you, how did we get into that funk, and how are you going to get us out of it?

The President. Well, first of all, before you draw that conclusion, I would urge you to read the entire pool report, on which the stories were——

Mr. Sperling. They weren't good translations I read in the——

The President. No, but I was basically very optimistic and upbeat about it. What I said was that there are a lot of contradictory things happening in American life now as a result of the fact that we're going through a period of profound change, and as you know from the stories, I believe the biggest change in the way we work, live, and relate to the rest of the world in 100 years, since we became an industrialized, more urbanized country, and since we got involved in World War I.

And I believe that in this time, there are a lot of things that seem contradictory and that are unsettling to people. And the American people have basically helped me to un-

derstand that, especially in the last year or so, just going out and listening to people talk about their own lives. I'll give you just, if I might, a couple of examples. If I had told you 30 months ago, when I became President, that we'd have 7½ million new jobs, 2½ million new homeowners, 2 million new businesses, a stock market at 4,700, the largest number of self-made millionaires in history, the entrepreneurial economy flourishing, and the median wage would go down, that would have been counter-intuitive.

But it has happened because of the complex forces in the global economy. Or if you look at the same thing happening in our society, we've got the crime rate down, the murder rate down, the welfare rolls down, the food stamp rolls down, the teenage pregnancy rate down 2 years in a row, even the divorce rate down, but violent crime among teenagers is up. Drug use among people between the ages of 18 and 34 down, but casual drug use among teenagers up. So there are these cross-cutting things. And it's perplexing to people, I think, and they feel it in their own lives.

And I think that the challenge for us all is to basically keep working for the future. You can't get—these periods of transitions come along every so often, and I feel very good about it. I feel very optimistic about the country. I think if you were betting on which country is likely to be in the strongest shape 20, 30 years from now in the 21st century, you'd have to bet on the United States because of the strength and diversity of our economy and our society. But we have some very, very important decisions to make, many of which will be made here in the next 60 days.

Reelection

Mr. Sperling. Mr. President, with the Republicans always trying to trip you up, and sometimes successfully, why in the world do you want 4 more years in the White House? Why not go home, you know, and go fishing?

The President. Because I believe that my vision of this country is the one that's best for the country. I believe that our policies best embody the values of the American people who want to see our country preserve the American dream and our country's ability

to lead the world and want to see families strengthened, want to see ordinary Americans have the chance to make the most of their own lives, and want to send the words of Governor Chiles from Florida, want to see us be a community, not a crowd, a set of people who don't just occupy the same space of ground and elbow each other until the strongest win and the weakest fall, but a group of people who believe that we're all better off when we recognize obligations to one another and act on those obligations within our families and across generational and income and other lines.

So I feel very optimistic about the future of this country, but especially now, I think it's more important to run than it was 4 years ago. Four years ago I ran because I thought there was no action being taken to give us a new economic policy based on opportunity, a new social policy based on responsibility, and to try to bring this country together and change the way the Government works. Now, I think the alternative vision out there is destructive of the future we want.

Mr. Sperling. Bob Thompson, I think, has a question. Then we'll move around the best we can. Carl.

The Presidency

Q. Mr. President, you've had 30 rather stormy months here. What are the lessons you've learned that you didn't know before about your office and its power and its authority?

The President. I think I had underestimated the importance of the President, even though I had read all the books and seen it all and experienced it in my lifetime. I think I had underestimated the importance of the Presidency as a bully pulpit, and the importance of what the President says and is seen to be saying and doing, as well as what the President does.

And I think that I underestimated—I had overemphasized in my first 2 years to some extent the importance of legislative battles as opposed to other things that the President ought to be doing. And I think now we have a better balance of both using the Presidency as a bully pulpit and the President's power of the Presidency to do things, actually accomplish things, and working on the process

in Congress but not defining—permitting the Presidency to be defined only by relationships with the Congress.

But I must say, they've been a stormy 30 months. It's been a stormy time for the country, but if you look at what has been accomplished, I think the record has been good for America and will be good for our future. The economy is in better shape. We passed the toughest crime bill in American history, and it's plainly playing a role in driving the crime rate down throughout the country. When there was no action on welfare reform, we gave two-thirds of the States—I think more than two-thirds now—the right to pursue their own reforms. And we have lowered the cost and increased the availability of a college education. We gave more kids a chance to get off to a good start in school. We've pushed school reforms that led to smaller classes, more computers and higher standards. We've advanced the cause of the environment while growing the economy. And we've downsized the Government and made it more efficient, far more than our predecessors who talked about doing that but didn't. And if you look at the record in foreign policy, the world is a safer, more prosperous place today because of the initiatives we've taken.

I mean, just in the last year, the efforts in the Middle East and Northern Ireland, in Haiti, the Japanese trade agreement, the North Korea nuclear initiative, the First Lady's trip to Beijing coming on the heels of the Cairo conference, and of course, the progress being made in Bosnia today. So it's a stormy time. But I think it's been a pretty productive time. And the American people, I think, are better off because of the things that we've done.

Transition Period

Q. Mr. President, I wanted to go back to the more philosophic view that you started out with and have been talking about recently, you've claimed that this is sort of a turning point, in 100-year cycles. Speaker Gingrich talks in those terms often also. And when we—in fact, was in the breakfast a couple of weeks ago—he talked a bit more in terms of the country has had several, seven or eight, cycles of history and that we're in

a period now—he really compares it to the early 1930's. A new majority is being built and he portrays it as that he's on the cutting edge of the new majority and last year's election, and that you're—I think he referred to once as perhaps the last defender of German socialism, but that you represent the old big Government style and that's he's the new style. Now, why—maybe you're both right. Is that possible?

The President. No. [Laughter] I mean, it's possible that there are elements in both our analyses that are right. But you know, as we say at home, that's their party line, and they have enough access and enough unity and enough discipline to spout the party line that they may be able to convince people of it. But it's blatantly untrue—I mean, to say that I'm the last defender of German socialism.

It is true that I don't approve of their plans to deny more children access to a healthy start in school or putting more old people out of nursing homes or walk away from all the lessons we've learned in the last 20 years, whether it's preserving our environment or maintaining some human standards in the way we run these nursing homes. It's true that I don't think that we ought to—I don't think a good reform for the future is making it harder for young people to go to college, thereby ensuring a decline in the college enrollment rate and continued aggravation of the income differentials.

It's true that I don't believe that it's a great idea to raise taxes on working families making \$15,000 a year to lower taxes on me, the people in my income group. That's true; I don't agree with that. But to talk about German socialism is ludicrous. Let me just—we had two Republican Presidents before I showed up. Who reduced the size of the Government more? There are 163,000 fewer people working for the Federal Government today than there were the day I became President. I might add, without one vote from a Republican in Congress, supporting me. The Democrats did it; all the Republicans voted against it.

Who reduced the number of regulations more—16,000 pages of regulations reduced by the Vice President's program. We supported school reforms, like charter schools,

which allow private groups of individuals to get a charter from school districts to run schools. I visited one of them in San Diego the other day.

Who gave more authority to States to pursue reforms in welfare and education—I mean, in health care? I did, more than the two previous Presidents combined. Who reduced regulation more in the Small Business Administration, the Department of Education, the EPA, you name it? We did. So that may be their line, but it's not the right line.

The truth is that I still believe that we have certain obligations to each other. That is really the difference. And that the Federal Government's job, to some extent, is to try to make sure that we are stronger as a community and that we give people an opportunity to make the most of their own lives and that we give their families and their communities a chance to solve their own problems and that when we walk away from that, experience shows us we pay a very high price.

So I think that if their view prevails, it may be more like the twenties than the thirties.

Russian Nuclear Cooperation With Iran

Q. Mr. President—[inaudible]—on to serious matters on foreign policy. Two things that, so far, you have been unable to solve, I want to ask you about them. Number one, the Russians are apparently sending not one, but four nuclear reactors to Iran. And there's a move in the Senate—in fact, the Senate passed an amendment last week—cutting off American aid to Russia if those reactors actually go to Iran. And second, the Russians have violated the CFE, Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty, although it only takes effect I think in the next couple of weeks. I think both parties have been honored to keep it. And you have said on both these issues in the past, sir, you have said we will not allow reactors to go to Iran and we do not think the Russians have any legal right to break that treaty. What is your position on those two issues right now, sir?

The President. Well, first of all, on the treaty, we are working very hard with them and where the two sides, I believe, are getting somewhat closer together. And I think if you talk—even the Europeans believe that

some accommodation can be reached, some agreement can be reached on the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty that is fair to the Russian position and still fulfills the purposes of the treaty. So I'm hopeful that there will be an accord reached there, and until we fail to reach one, I don't think I should comment further.

On the Iranian nuclear reactor, you know what our position is. We think it's wrong. The Vice President—maybe he wants to say a word about it—has worked very hard through the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission to try to work through this. You know, their position is that this contract was made at a previous time and that they are basically giving them the same kind of reactor we proposed to help the North Koreans build. And so they disagree with our position. Our position is the North Koreans have certain nuclear capacity, and we're building it down, why should we give the Iranians anything?

And so we're continuing to work with them on it. And I hope that ultimately we will be able to work this out. I do believe that a lot of these threats, given the present state of play in Russia and where their Duma is and the way they talk may be counterproductive. I mean, it may not further the objectives that the Congress seeks. Do you want to add anything to that?

The Vice President. Well, I think, you began by referencing a report on multiple reactors that I think was based on a news story that was garbled in the telling. And we can go into more detail later on that one. I just urge you not to give too much credence to that particular report.

But as the President said, the dialog is continuing, and they've agreed to——

Q. They're not sending—they're not sending the reactors——

The Vice President. You mentioned four reactors, that was—well, the one negotiation is the one that is still the subject of our dealings with them. It antedated our time in office, but they have agreed to continue a dialog on possibly canceling that sale. It is, as the President said, not a violation of any international law or treaty. Notwithstanding that fact, they understand the seriousness with which we do it. We're pressing it very hard. We do not accept that it is a good thing

for them to do, and we hope to be able to convince them to back off it.

Wage Levels

Q. Mr. President, if during the first 3 years of your administration, the economy has basically been doing well, but the median wage has been going down, then that suggests that whatever it was that you were doing for the economy, especially when the Democrats were fully in control of Congress and the Presidency, was not enough. Now, if you were re-elected, what would you do to help the average working person in the country? And what would you be able to do, especially if the Congress remained in Republican hands?

The President. Well, first of all, what I suggest is that, keep in mind, these trends of wage stagnation go—depending on whose numbers you look at—go back at least 15, and perhaps 20, years. So I think it's unrealistic to think that you can turn them around in 2 years. But I believe there are certain things that we need to do.

First of all, I think that if we can—the expansion of trade, which we have pushed, has generated about 2 million new jobs. On average, those have been higher wage-paying jobs. I think we need to do things that change the job mix. That is a slow but an important remedy. So that a high percentage of the total number of jobs in America have a higher average income. In order to do that, we not only have to continue our trade policies, we must continue to invest in research and development and in new technologies.

Now that has been something that hasn't been noticed at all in this budget debate. But one of the quarrels I have with the congressional budget is that it takes our R&D budget down by roughly six-tenths of a percent of GDP. And a lot of Republican high-tech executives are very concerned about it. They believe it will lead to a loss of America's position in a lot of important industries over the next 5 years. So changing the job mix is an important part of it.

Continuing to get a higher and higher percentage of people in education is an important part of it. I have given the Congress one proposal, which I thought looked very much like a Republican program, which I expected

them to embrace, the so-called “GI bill” for America’s workers, in which we proposed to consolidate 70 Labor Department training programs and not block grant them to the States but give them in the form of vouchers to unemployed people and welfare people so that when people lose their jobs, they can immediately go back to a new training program.

Thirty years ago, 80 percent of the people who were laid off from work were called back to their old jobs. Today, 80 percent of the people who are laid off are not called back to their old jobs. And it’s bad for employers and for employees—because employers pay unemployment—bad for employers and employees to let people traipse around looking for jobs when what they really need is to immediately be in a retraining program.

I think we should raise the minimum wage. It’s going to go to a 40-year low if we don’t. I think we should avoid gutting the earned-income tax credit for working families. I think that’s one of the two or three worst things in the congressional budget. It will aggravate income inequality.

And I think, frankly, the proposals that we have endorsed that the Congress is working on from the Jordan Commission will have some impact. If we lower the aggregate number of legal immigrants coming into the country, even by a modest amount, it will free up more jobs to people who now don’t have any, and it will tighten the labor market some.

I talked to the Governor of Nebraska the other day, the State with our lowest unemployment rate, and I said, “Do you think when we’re creating all these jobs, it’s going to ever raise wages?” He said, “Yes.” He said, “I just don’t think the markets are quite tight enough in the country.” He said, “In Nebraska, wages are up and even at the places that used to not give benefits—fast food places—they’re all giving health care benefits now and wages are up.” So he said, “I think if you can get the unemployment rate down maybe another half a point, you can get that done.”

So those are my ideas for raising the wages levels: Change the job mix, improve the training, continue to expand trade, raise the minimum wage and have a modest reduction

in the number of legal immigrants. We’ll still be a country of immigrants, but we should lower the total. We raised it, after all, dramatically, in 1990 to help deal with the cold war. We’ve done a lot of that, and I think we should come back down now.

Colin Powell

Q. Mr. President, how do you explain the Colin Powell phenomenon?

The President. That’s your job, not mine. [Laughter]

Q. We need help. [Laughter]

The President. No, you do just fine. I’m the President. [Laughter]

Unpopular Issues

Q. Mr. President, you started off with a great laundry list of things that have happened in your administration so far, and yet, we had a Republican dominated Congress come into office last fall. And there’s a lot of animosity toward you personally out there in the public. How do you account for that?

The President. That requires political analysis, too. Look, I took on a lot of tough issues, and I made a lot of people mad. You know, look at what they said about my economic program in 1993. They tried to convince every American I’d raise their income taxes when I haven’t. They said it would bring on a recession.

You all ever ask them when they’re having their press conferences how they won the Congress on a false premise? They said, you know, it was going to be the end of the world if—the end of the world if the Clinton economic program were passed, we’d have a terrible recession. Instead, we had the best economic performance we’ve had in two or three decades.

I made a lot of people—you know, the House—I still believe if you analyze those races, race by race by race, the House of Representatives is in Republican hands today because we took on the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. And everybody knew they were unpopular. People said to me, “Don’t do this. There’s a reason no President has ever taken on the NRA. There is a reason for this. I don’t care what the poll says, the people who are against this will vote against everybody who votes for it, and the people

who are for it will find another reason to vote against it. They won't have any convictions. Only the antis will have convictions." But I'll tell you something, 40,000 people last year didn't get guns because of it, 40,000 people with criminal records.

And if we keep a few Uzis off the streets and out of the schools, and we keep a few more innocent kids from being shot down at bus stops, it was worth it. You know, I had the same argument here on the tobacco thing. They said, "You've got to be crazy. There's a reason no sitting President has ever taken these people on. They'll scare all those good tobacco farmers to death. They'll vote out Democrats. They'll say you're trying to have the Government take over people's lives. Don't do this. This is a dumb thing to do. I don't care what the polls say. They'll all be against you, and the people that are for you will find another reason to vote against you."

Q. And—

The President. And—let me finish. You asked this question, I want to—and I believe—you know, we know 3,000 kids a day start smoking. We know that—at least we know some of those tobacco interests have known for 30 years it was destructive and addictive. We know 1,000 of those kids are going to die early. If you want to do things, you've got to make people mad. And if the people you make mad have access to television programs, radio programs, access to channels of communication, they will go wacky, and they will generate animosity.

Now, I will say this, my sense is that the level of personal animosity has gone down as people see who's really fighting for real family values and real interests of American families and real interests of small business and trying to give ordinary people a chance to make the most of their own lives. But you know, I did not take this job to try to maintain high levels of popularity.

You go back and look; I had a very specific agenda I was going to try to implement. And I was well aware that people would be against it. Look at this—look at this budget debate on the student loans. They even went through an accounting gimmick to try to convince people that the direct student loan program was more expensive than the guaran-

teed student loan program, when everybody in America knows it's not true. Why? Because they want to take money away from students and give it back to bankers.

Well, the people that lost their money weren't happy. The people that were going to benefit from the student loan program—there weren't enough of them to know that at election time. I think the main thing that we all have to do is to figure out what we believe and fight for it and be willing to work together with people who disagree with us, if we can find honest, common ground. And we'll let the popularity take care of itself. I just tried to do what I said I would do when I ran.

Q. Just to follow up, do you wish, in retrospect, you might not have taken on a few of those, like gays in the military?

The President. Well, to be fair, I didn't take that on. That was an issue that was visited on the Presidency. I mean, I could have said, "We'll just let the courts go through that." But let's talk about that. That's become more of a slogan than a fact. The position I took, remember, was not that we should change the rules of conduct, which prohibited homosexual activity, but that we should not ask people or persecute people for their failure to lie about their sexual orientation. That position was endorsed by Barry Goldwater and by most of the combat veterans of the Vietnam war serving in the United States Congress.

Now, the military thought it went too far, so what did we do? We changed the position. We studied it for a few months. We changed it. We wound up with a position with which we fought two World Wars, Korea, and Vietnam. We did not bring an end to military order in our time. All we did was to change the position that was put in in President Reagan's tenure.

And look, the United States Government was covered up with lawsuits. We were losing lawsuits. I suppose the easy thing to do would say, "Oh, well, let the courts go forward." I was trying to find a way to put an end to this so that the military could just put this issue behind it and go on being the world's best military. And you may disagree with the position I took or the position that we came out with, but the position we're in now is

roughly how we won two World Wars and fought through Korea and Vietnam. It's hardly the end of civilization as we know it.

And the other position would not have been either.

Q. [Inaudible].

The President. Well, I didn't have any choice. It was brought up—the people who brought it up were the Republican Senators. They made it their number one legislative—go back and read the chronology of how all this came up. They stirred it and swung it and made sure it was the number one issue of the world. Do I wish I had never taken a position on it? You know, I often say what I think. My position on this was basically taken in the campaign when someone asked me about it. And by the way, don't forget one other thing. There was also evidence which was being put into all these court cases that the military knew that they had some gay service members who were permitted to serve in Desert Storm because they were needed and they were good service members, and then they were kicked out, which I thought was not a very good thing. All this happened before I showed up.

Civil Rights

Q. Mr. President, your home State in 1968 voted for George Wallace, the State that produced Orval Faubus, Little Rock Central High School. Even your severest critics—[inaudible]—acknowledge your own long and strong commitment to civil rights. Do you think—[inaudible]—see the country change, that America is ready to elect a black President?

The President. I would hope that the American people could evaluate any candidate without regard to their race or their gender. And I would hope that that would be the case. You know, that's the way I've lived my life. That's the way I've staffed my administration. That's the way I've done my work, and that's what I hope is the case in this country.

Debt Limit

Q. Mr. President, Speaker Gingrich has—[inaudible]—unilateral right to refuse to schedule a vote which would then suspend the raging debt limit. Does that create prob-

lems for you—both the procedure where the Speaker claims a unilateral veto and the threat to raise the debt limit?

The President. Well, I think it's wrong. I mean, I think it is wrong not to raise the debt limit. The United States in over 200 years has never defaulted on its debt. We have paid our debts. We have been an honorable citizen in that sense. And it is simply wrong.

I would also say it would ultimately be self-defeating. If what the Republicans in Congress want to do is to balance the budget, rather than to destroy the Federal Government, then I share their goal. And I have given them a balanced budget plan, and my door has been open from the beginning to work with them on that.

If we were to default on our debt, you have seen already in other countries, in events just in the last 12 months, how rapidly the financial markets react to such things. And what they would do is to say that the United States is no longer reliable. Then the cost of carrying our debt, the interest rates, would be raised, and that would make it harder to balance the budget. We'd spend more and more and more of taxpayers' money on interest payments on the debt, and less and less on national defense or education or anything else. It's ultimately self-defeating, and it's wrong, and it's irresponsible, and it's not necessary.

We can reach an accord here on balancing the budget. But there is a process that we have to go through to do that. We are not going to have a unilaterally dictated budget; we are going to have a discussion about it. And as I said, more than any Democrat in many years, I've shown not only a willingness but a desire to make the Government smaller, less bureaucratic, more entrepreneurial, and to target investments while reducing unnecessary spending. We can make this work.

But blackmail is not they way to do it, and I'm not going to be blackmailed. And I'm not going to just sign a budget that I know will put people out of nursing homes or deprive people of the chance to go to college or children the chance to be in Head Start or compromise the environment. I'm not going to do that; I'm just not going to do that. We can get a balanced budget that the

entire financial world thinks is a great thing. But it has to be done in an honorable way, and defaulting on our debts is not an honorable thing to do.

NAFTA

Q. Mr. President, just to follow up on your remarks here about the trade policy. The initial Commerce Department numbers indicate a modest dropoff—[inaudible]—NAFTA. That was expected. What wasn't expected is that what was a U.S. trade surplus with Mexico has become a trade deficit. Given the job loss and given the worsening trade numbers, has NAFTA turned out to be a worse deal than you expected? And politically, given the strength of economic nationalism in many parts of the country, do you have any fear that NAFTA is going to end up hurting you in a lot of key industrial States next year?

The President. Well, let's analyze it. Let me answer the question on the merit first. What happened in the short run was that NAFTA was a much better deal for us in the first year than we thought it would be. We had a much bigger trade surplus than we thought we'd have. We generated far more new jobs than we thought we would and they were basically high-wage jobs. And because of the financial difficulties of Mexico, which were unanticipated, it turned out to be a worse deal in the second year than we thought it would be. And because we ran a trade deficit, which we did anticipate once the Mexican economy went down, we have a slight net job loss.

Does that mean NAFTA was a mistake? No, for two reasons. Number one, if the Mexican economy had gone through what it has just gone through without NAFTA and without the trading relationship with the United States, they would be in even worse shape; we would have a bigger illegal immigration problem; we would have a bigger period of instability down there; democracy would be more at risk in Mexico. And we would be worse off than we are with NAFTA.

It is unfortunate that the Mexican economy—that they tried to expand it too fast and in some ways it were improvident and they didn't cut back in an election year. And then, from my point of view, there was an

overcorrection by the financial markets. They punished them too much. But still, we are better off vis-a-vis Mexico than we would have been if NAFTA hadn't passed. If NAFTA hadn't passed we'd have a trade deficit with Mexico this year because they wouldn't be able to buy anything from us.

The second reason it was the right thing to do is, in a period like this where things are changing so rapidly, you cannot calculate from month to month or year to year. If you look at 10 years from now, 20 years from now, 25 years from now, it is plainly the right thing to do. A strong, stable, healthy, democratic Mexico with a sensible economy is plainly in our interest. It will stabilize our borders. It will help us economically. And it will promote our goal of a world trading system and a world moving toward democracy and peace. So I think it's the right to do.

On the politics of it, it was always a political risk for a Democrat to do what I did on NAFTA. But I believed in it. And it was one of the changes I thought the Democratic Party had to go for, not to give up fair trade, which is embodied in the Japanese trade agreement, but to go for free trade as well, to go for more open trade. It's just what I believe is the right thing to do, and I'll live with the political consequences.

Capital Gains Tax

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you a question that I hear a lot of people around the country asking, and that is, would the cut in the capital gains tax that is enacted by both the Senate and the House, in itself, be reason enough for you to veto a bill that contains those provisions?

The President. I probably should be a little chagrined to admit this, but I am not absolutely sure what the precise provisions were of their tax. Let me say this: I believe my obligation is to try to reach a balanced budget. There will be a tax cut in this balanced budget. I want the tax cut, as much as possible, directed toward people who are out there working for a living, dealing with the economic uncertainties in the marketplace, trying to raise their children and educate themselves and their children. That's what I believe.

I also believe that we have provided quite a good environment for investors in this country. As I said, we have more self-made millionaires in the last 2 years than any comparable time period in American history and the stock market is at 4,700. You know that I'm not philosophically opposed to all capital gains taxes because we had a capital gains tax in the '93 economic plan that cut the tax rate 50 percent on people that invested in new or small businesses for 5 years. And I was prepared to go with the Bumpers bill, which would have taken it down to zero, if the investments went longer.

So, my answer to you, sir, is it depends on what form the capital gains tax is in in the final bill and how it works and will it really fulfill our objectives. What are our objectives? We want more jobs and higher incomes. If it's consistent with an overall package that gives more jobs and higher incomes, certainly I would consider that. I would be obliged to consider that. I cannot tell the Republican majority that they have to consider compromising with me and then we not considering trying to reach out to them. But the test should be: Does it give you jobs and incomes? That's really what we need to do in this country.

Mood of the Country

Q. I just wanted to return to the original question—[*inaudible*—asked about the funk that the Nation appears to be in. And I wonder if you could explain to us what your point is there and what it is a President can do about a nation that's in a funk? And are we going to see any more appearances of the Blues Brothers? [*Laughter*]

The President. If I thought it would help, I'd sure do it.

Last year, last November, plainly the country was in kind of an anxious mood, a negative mood, a frustrated mood about the Government. And I was saying that I thought that one of the reasons that it happened is that I had inadequately fulfilled—to go back to the first question that was asked back here—I had inadequately filled the first responsibility of the President, in terms of the bully pulpit, in terms of trying to say, here's the change we're going through; here's how I think it's going to come out all right; here's

my vision for it; let's do this based on our fundamental values of work and family and responsibility.

I think the country is sort of moving into a more positive frame of mind as we see more and more good economic news, and as we see more and more evidence that some problems we thought couldn't be solved, you can actually make progress on them. I mean, 5 years ago, if you had asked people, do you think you could ever bring the crime rate down, they'd probably say no. Well, now the crime rate's going down in virtually every city and State in the country, largely because people have figured out that these community policing strategies, among other things, really work.

So what I'm saying is, what I think we have to do is to be optimistic about the future. But to do it, we have to understand that the news—we live in a good news/bad news time, like all tumultuous times. And we have to understand what we have to do to get more good news and what we have to do to attack the bad. And I think once you understand that, that increases your level of security and your level of optimism. And this country thrives on optimism. We have to maintain our optimism.

These problems we have are not insoluble. But we have to just keep that upbeat outlook. And I sense that more and more people are looking at the future in that way and balancing the scales in what I would consider to be an accurate way. And I think it's because the American people are pretty smart, and they are sensing all these things in their own lives.

Medicare

Q. [*Inaudible*—lead editorial accusing the House Democrats of demagoging the Medicare issue. Are you concerned that the tactics taken by the House Democrats are losing the battle of public opinion? And how would you characterize your view on Medicare vis-a-vis the House Democrats?

The President. Well, I think institutionally we have different responsibilities. And you can see that, I think, by the way the majority carried out their responsibilities when they were in the minority.

My job, I believe, is to present a balanced budget, and I have done it. My job is to present an alternative plan for Medicare and Medicaid which will be part of a balanced budget and which will also help the Medicare Trust Fund to lengthen its life. That is my job.

Historically, minority parties in the Congress have thought that their main job was to point out what they disagreed with with the majority's proposal. And that is, after all, what the people who are now in the majority did for the last two years before they became the majority, on every conceivable issue.

Now, so the idea that they should fashion an alternative is—there are cases in which they have—they did have an alternative welfare reform bill, for example. But I think in the end they will be voting for an alternative. They think their job right now is to point out some facts which have been lost in this debate. For example, let's just take the Medicare issue. The congressional majority relies on the report of the trustees in Medicare, coming out of the HHS process. They say Medicare is in trouble, and we have to help it. And we have, as you know, added 3 years to the life of the Trust Fund in the first 2 years of my administration.

But then they say—we agree with them on that, but they're not right about medical inflation, and they're not right about how much it costs to fix it. So what the Democrats are pointing out is that basically that the Republican proposal cuts Medicare 3 times as much as the trustees say is necessary to stabilize the Trust Fund and that at least half of the Medicare cuts are coming from beneficiaries, out of a pot that has nothing to do with the Trust Fund.

So that since a lot of these people live on \$400, \$500, \$600 a month Social Security, these proposals, if you look at the Senate proposal, these proposals will in effect lower their income by 5 to 10 percent in the context of a budget which will raise the income of some of the wealthiest people in the country by cutting their taxes. Now, I think that's a very useful thing for them to be doing. As long as we know that in the end, we've got to balance the budget and bail out the Trust Fund, it needs to be pointed out that the Medicare cuts are 3 times what is necessary

to fix the Trust Fund. And it needs to be pointed out that the impact, therefore, is to lower the incomes of the elderly poor while we're going to raise other people's incomes.

Q. Why do you suppose that the Washington Post and other normally sympathetic newspapers and other institutions see that as demagoguery?

The President. Well, you'd have to ask them. But I think that part of it is, they see that, over the long run, this entitlements question is going to have to be dealt with. And so they figure that anybody that—they just want to see as many proposals as possible dealing with the entitlements question. I agree with that.

But keep in mind—let me just say—there are two issues here in Medicare that shouldn't be lost, and I don't want to over-complicate this. The first question is, right now, from now until the end of the decade and into the first few years of the next century, let's stabilize the Medicare trust fund so that we get back up to where it normally has been over the last 30 years. You know, let's get—we ought to—excuse me—ought to always have a life of, you know, 10, 11 years, something like that to stabilize it.

The second issue is a very big issue, but it's totally unaddressed here, and that is what happens when the baby boom retires and how will that change things? There ought to be a long-term effort to address that. But that is not addressed by any of these proposals here, and so we shouldn't confuse them.

Colin Powell

Q. Mr. President, I realize this is probably our job, too, but I wonder if you would help us and tell us what you think is the defining difference between you and Colin Powell?

The President. Near as I can tell, he's—I will tell you this. I was grateful for his statement—and this is no criticism of him to say this, I want to emphasize that—I wish that more Americans who agreed on the assault weapons ban and the Brady bill had been out there last November. It might have made a difference. But that's not a criticism of him because he's coming out of a period of military service when he didn't feel that he should be a public spokesman.

I was grateful for what he said about abortion, that he didn't want to criminalize it, but that we should reduce it and emphasize adoption more because that's what I've worked very hard to do. And the First Lady's emphasized that, and we've done a lot to facilitate, for example, cross-racial adoptions and things of that kind.

I was grateful for what he said about affirmative action, because I believe in the kind of affirmative action practiced in the United States Army, and I don't believe it constitutes quotas or reverse discrimination or giving unqualified people things they shouldn't have.

So all I can say to you is that on those statements that he has made, I am profoundly appreciative. I think it's helped America to stay kind of in the sensible center and moving forward instead of being pulled too far in one direction or the other.

Speaker Newt Gingrich

Q. Mr. President, I know you have many defining differences with Newt Gingrich, but what is your working relationship like with him? Do you find it productive? And secondly, do you think you'll be able to come to agreement on most of these big issues this year, whether it's Medicare, welfare, the budget, tort reform, maybe even regulatory reform?

The President. Our personal relationship has basically been candid and cordial. And I've enjoyed our conversations, and they're basically—our private conversations are basically free of political posturing; they're candid, and they're straightforward. I'm sure that I do things that frustrate him, and sometimes he does things that frustrate me. I think this debt ceiling issue is wrong. And I think when he shook hands with me in New Hampshire on political reform and lobby reform and said we'd appoint a commission, we should have done it. I mean, that frustrates me. But we have, I think, a basically a decent working relationship on a personal level.

Do I think we'll reach an agreement on most of the issues? I do. I believe in America. I believe in the process. I believe that it's time for us to adopt a balanced budget. I think it's the right thing to do. But it is time to adopt a balanced budget consistent with

growing the economy and growing the middle class and shrinking the under class and making this country stronger, which means we can't just turn away from things like education and technology and research. And it's time to do it consistent with our obligations to our children and our parents, which means we can't turn away from what we should be doing on the environment, for example.

So I think—but do I believe we will get an agreement? I do. This country's not around here after all this time because we let the trains run off the tracks. It's around here because people of good faith who have honest differences find principle compromises and common ground. And that's what I think will happen here; that's what I believe will happen. I think there's too much energy in the country saying, make this country work and move this country forward, for us to turn back.

Q. So you expect to have a series of signing ceremonies—

The President. I do. I think there will be some—there may be some vetoes first, but I think in the end, we'll reach accord. That's what I believe will happen.

Legalized Gambling

Q. Mr. President—[inaudible]—this morning on the spread of legalized gambling. More and more cities and States are relying on it as a source of income. And at the same time, there's been an increase in the social consequences of gambling, has prompted Senators Lugar and Simon to call for a Government commission on the subject. One scientist estimated that three dollars in social costs for every dollar that the States and cities take in. What's your position on legalized gambling? Are you for a national lottery, or—

The President. No.

Q. —or are you somewhere down the line?

The President. I've always been against it, all my—

Q. What's your feeling about this?

The President. Well, first of all, let me just say, I mean, this is another one of my unpopular positions, I know, because it's very popular everywhere, because it looks like easy money. It's tax money that doesn't seem to be tax money. People give it up freely,

instead of by paying—you know, filling out a form. But let me give you a little background.

I grew up—when I grew up in Hot Springs, Arkansas, until I was a teenager, my hometown had the largest illegal gambling establishment in America. And it was basically permitted to operate with a wink and a nod from the State and local law enforcement officials. The only good thing about it being illegal was that it kept all the national syndicates out of it. It was sort of a home-grown deal that had existed for many, many years, going back to the twenties. But I'm quite familiar with this. And then there was a move to legalize it in the late sixties, which failed a vote.

And then when I was Governor, we had another vote on legalizing gambling in very limited ways and in just certain places. And I opposed it, and we defeated it again. And we did it because I believe that it disguised the social costs and because I believed it was not a good way to raise public funds. The lotteries are not so onerous; they're much more—they're more benign than other legalized gambling. I think. And States obviously have a right to do it.

But I wouldn't favor a national lottery because all we'd do is just saturate the market. We would weaken the States that are already doing it. We'd be taking money away from them and complicating it. And I don't favor any other kind of national legalized gambling efforts just because, based on my own personal experience and what I saw and what I know are the side effects, I just would not be in favor of it.

Q. Do you support the commission? The idea—[inaudible]—Federal commission?

The President. I would be glad to consider it. This is the first I've ever heard of it so I don't have an opinion.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, if NATO air strikes have helped advance the cause of peace in Bosnia, in hindsight should we have done this earlier?

The President. Well, as you know, the United States was willing to do it earlier. And I think we—let me—let's review the last 2½ years. We had a pretty peaceful 1994 because

of the threat of NATO air power. We had a pretty peaceful 1994. The death rate went way down in Bosnia. But there was no progress made at the negotiating table. And then the Bosnian Serbs determined that they could take hostages and avoid the threat of air power. And they wound up doing it, and it worked. That is, we were unable to persuade our allies to take action through the air until after Srebrenica and Zepa fell. Then the London Conference occurred. There was a renewed commitment, and I was convinced at the time that our allies really meant it. And that air action combined with the diplomatic initiative of Dick Holbrooke and the members of his team, and the gains on the ground of the Croatian and the Bosnian armies, all those things together contributed to the circumstance which we have now.

So if there had been a stronger allied response earlier, would it have made a difference? I think it quite likely could have. But I—and, you know, we can revisit that. The main thing we need to say is that we have a chance now to make a decent and an honorable peace. The changes on the ground, the diplomatic mission, and the bombing campaign all contributed to it.

Two-Party System

Q. Mr. President, you've mentioned the frustration in the country. You think that one of the things you're going to be dealing with next year is a climate politically where people don't like either party, where basically it's sort of "a plague in both your houses." And how do you really—how do you deal with that? Isn't that one of the reasons for the increasing popularity of people like Colin Powell?

The President. Well, I think, first of all, if you look historically, that is not an atypical development in a transition period, because the debate becomes wider and people become more open to different things. Some of them are quite good and sensible, some of them are, in my judgment, too extreme. But we had, I think, four parties on the ballot in the 1948 Presidential election, just to mention one period of transition.

Both psychologically and substantively things, you know, began to be more open. I think in this time period—I think the—

you know, when people have 50 channels on their television station at night, if you say would you rather have three parties instead of two, it's pretty obvious what the answer's going to be.

And the third thing I would say is—and this is a challenge that I think, frankly, those of you who are in the print media can perhaps help us to meet. The information age is a mixed blessing for serious public policy and politics, because the pressures on people who live in Washington to speak in terms that aggravate the differences and simplify the issues so that they can get their 10 or 15 seconds over to the American people at night are enormous. And sometimes it benefits one party, sometimes it benefits another, and they win a big election victory over it. But the aggregate impact of it is if it doesn't quite resonate with what people think is the whole truth—all the facts—is to make people disillusioned with the process, even as they reward people who may be kind of shaving it in ways that are not good.

So, one of the things I'm looking forward to in the next election is to try to restore what I thought we had in 1992, that I thought was so good—you know, the town meetings, the debates and the different formats, the debates—the debates in which people were involved and could ask their questions. All those things, I felt, helped to restore people's faith in the system.

So I do believe—one thing I agree with Speaker Gingrich on, I think that over time, the American people have been well served by basically having two stable political parties.

But I would remind you that one reason that's worked is that both parties have had a rather broad tent. They have had philosophical convictions. There have been clear differences, but they have made room in their parties for people of different views so they could make principle compromises and keep moving the country forward.

I think that is what has worked best for America over the long run. The American people will be the final judge of what will work best in the future.

Campaign Finance Reform

Q. Mr. President, we've been talking, really since—[inaudible]—first question about the frustration, and you've answered somewhat philosophically. There's one thing that hasn't really changed since 1992 and that's the way we raise money to pay for this thing. You spent much of last week, some of it in semi-private forums, basically building your kitty so you could run next year, before the public money kicks in. Isn't there a better way? And isn't some of the frustration that we see in the country related to the cynicism that develops from the way we fund our politics?

The President. I believe it is, of course. And I think some of the things that were done in 1974, in an attempt to promote reform after Watergate, in a curious way, within a period of 20 years, may have made the process worse because it tended to mean that a higher percentage of fundraising, particularly for Members of Congress, was more concentrated around specific issues. So that I don't think that's what the people meant to do in '74, but I think it had the—you know, devolving things to PAC's and all that gives the appearance, if not the reality, that more and more of the fundraising is tied to specific decisions. And I don't think that's good.

And I did what I could to persuade the previous Congress, as you know, unsuccessfully, to pass campaign finance reform. And I thought that in this Congress, the only way we could do it is if we had some sort of commission, like the gentleman from New Hampshire suggested, kind of a base closing commission, which would in effect bring both the parties together. I still think that's a good idea.

I have done everything I know to do. I wrote the Speaker back; I accepted his offer. I even named two people that I would have participate in the commission. I cannot force Congress to do this. But I believe we would be better off. I think the Presidential elections—I think in the general election, I think the American people—there is one other problem here, though, to be fair, and that is, the American people themselves have very ambivalent feelings about public financing. They can—and the people that are against

campaign finance reform can always say, can't you think of something better to do with your money than give it to a politician?

So I think, to make the next steps—that's why I was hoping a commission would also spark a lot of public debate here. But I do believe that in the general election, like in 1992, when it was all publicly funded, everybody had a fair chance, and we devoted a lot of our time to these more open discussions and not just the sound bites, I think public confidence in the institution rose. And I think that when Congress is dealing with issues and simultaneously people see the fundraising going on, it sparks cynicism even if everybody is in there doing exactly what they believe, even if you read it in the best times.

So I still believe campaign finance reform is important. I can't think of any way to get there except a commission. And I still hope the Speaker will accept my offer, again, and act on it.

Mood of the Country

Q. Well, Mr. President, I've come here today thinking that the nation is in somewhat of a funk. You've just about convinced me otherwise. [*Laughter*] And so, in view of the way Pat Caddell hung "malaise" around Jimmy Carter's neck back in '79, an editorialist may be having a lot of fun with "funk." I wondered if possibly that was a bad—not an accurate word, or would you maybe change it?

The President. It was no doubt a poor choice of words. And it was more of a characterization of how people felt a year ago, maybe, than they do now. But I do believe—to be fair, what I think is that times—we all are for change in general, but we tend to oppose it in particular. That is, there's a limit to how much change that almost any of us can endure in our own lives at one time. And what I really do believe has happened is as people go through these kinds of sweeping changes in the way they live and work and the way their nation relates to the rest of the world and apparently contradictory events occur, you know, we just have to—

I think that there needs to be an extra effort to keep the American people positive about our future, upbeat about our prospects, and realistic about what our opportunities as well as our problems are. And I think it will be difficult to convince people that I am advocating the politics of a national funk—[*laughter*]—because, you know, it's so inconsistent with my own outlook toward life and the way we try to do things around here. And so I'm hopeful.

I hope I didn't—I hope I served a valuable purpose with that rather long discourse. And again, I would urge you all to read it because I was trying to explain to the people who were on the plane and through them to all the rest of you, because I figured they'd write it up in the pool report, kind of how I have analyzed this period, but not because I'm down about the prospects of the future. I'm, to the contrary, quite optimistic.

Mr. Sperling. Mr. President, we are told we have to close this extraordinarily fine—

Q. One followup.

Mr. Sperling. I'd really like to—I'd like to close the session early. And what I want to talk about it is how grateful I am that you're sitting down with a bunch of us print journalists, because we see you again and again on television—[*laughter*]—and yeah, we're not that bad a lot. And I think it's worthwhile. [*Laughter*] I hope you come in again. And thank you so very much.

The President. Thank you. Now, wait, wait. We're not done yet.

Mr. Sperling. We're going to take care of Rollie?

The President. No, we're going to take care of you. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Sperling. Sorry, Rollie, I had to—

The President. Now—but we're going to do what Rollie wanted to do in the beginning. Come on. Are we ready?

[*At this point, a cake was brought in, and the group sang "Happy Birthday" to Mr. Sperling.*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:40 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

Statement on the Future of Federal Laboratories*September 25, 1995*

On May 5, 1994, I directed the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to review their major laboratories. These three laboratory systems account for approximately one-fifth of the Federal investment in research and development (R&D)—approximately \$15 billion out of a total of about \$70 billion. I sought a study that would assess the continuing value of these laboratories in serving vital public needs, and I wanted an evaluation of options for change within these labs for the purpose of cutting costs and improving R&D productivity.

Informed by that review, I am announcing today an initial set of directives which will affect these laboratories well into the future.

I have concluded that these laboratories provide essential services to the Nation in fundamental science, national security, environmental protection and cleanup, and industrial competitiveness. Many of these laboratories are equipped with research tools that are among the finest in the world. They employ personnel with extraordinary, and in many cases irreplaceable, talent. These labs have contributed greatly to our Nation in the past and hold the potential for contributions of tremendous importance in the future.

One example where the national laboratories can help change the course of history is with respect to nuclear weapons. On August 11, 1995, I announced my decision to seek a "zero" yield Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). I was able to make that decision based on assurances by the Secretary of Energy and the Directors of the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons labs that we can meet the challenge of maintaining our nuclear deterrent under a CTBT through a science-based stockpile stewardship program without nuclear testing.

To meet the challenge of ensuring confidence in the safety and reliability of our stockpile, I have concluded that the continued vitality of all three DOE nuclear weapons laboratories will be essential.

In accordance with this conclusion, I have directed the Department of Energy to maintain nuclear weapons responsibilities and capabilities adequate to support the science-based stockpile stewardship program required to ensure continued confidence in the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile in the absence of nuclear testing. Stable funding for this effort based on bipartisan support will be necessary in order to meet this requirement.

Strong bipartisan support equally is necessary across a broad range of other science and technology programs being performed in Federal laboratories, academia, and the private sector. Since the beginning of my administration, we have placed a high priority on investments in science and technology. We believe that few areas of Federal spending will be more important to the well-being of future generations than R&D. We are deeply concerned about budget actions that could cripple our capacity to find new ways of solving the scientific and technological challenges of the 21st century.

Among our greatest strengths as our Nation moves into the next century will be our ability to innovate—to design new drugs, to find new ways to enhance our national security, to develop new tools for managing enormous amounts of information, to generate new ways of harnessing energy, to produce new materials and processes that result in new products and industries at lower cost and with less pollution, and to expand the frontiers of our knowledge of the universe. These laboratories have excelled in such innovations as these, and will continue to yield great public dividends for our Federal investment.

At the same time, these labs must be run as efficiently as possible. I have directed the agencies to review and, as appropriate, to rescind internal management instructions and oversight that impede laboratory performance. I have directed the agencies to clarify and focus the mission assignments of their laboratories. I also have directed the agencies to achieve all possible budget savings through streamlining and management improvements before productive R&D programs are sacrificed. Many agencies and laboratories al-

ready are making important progress in each of these areas of management reform.

It has been said that R&D investments are an expression of our confidence as a Nation in our future. Today we are reaping the benefits of those who wisely invested in Federal R&D in the past. While it would be easy to destroy premier Federal laboratories through severe budget cuts or senseless closures, that is not a path that this Administration will follow. We will invest in our Federal laboratories, while pursuing aggressive management reforms that ensure the maximum productive output for the taxpayers' investments.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Radio Spectrum Assignments

September 25, 1995

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)
(Dear Mr. Chairman:)*

Title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 requires that the Secretary of Commerce identify 200 megahertz (MHz) of the radio spectrum assigned to Federal Government use for reallocation to the Federal Communications Commission for non-federal use.

Under delegated authority, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) is responsible for managing the Federal Government's use of the radio spectrum. On March 22, 1995, Secretary of Commerce Ronald Brown submitted to you NTIA's Spectrum Reallocation Final Report that identified for reallocation in August 1995, the 2300–2310 and 2400–2402 MHz bands for exclusive nonfederal use and the 2417–2450 MHz band for mixed Federal and nonfederal use.

I am pleased to inform you that the Federal Government frequency assignments in the spectrum identified for reallocation for exclusive nonfederal use have been withdrawn by NTIA in compliance with section 114 of the Act. In addition, modifications were made to the National Table of Frequency Allocations for Government stations to reflect the reallocation of the spectrum.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate, and Reed E. Hundt, Chair, Federal Communications Commission.

Remarks Prior to a Meeting with Members of Congress and an Exchange with Reporters

September 26, 1995

The President. First of all, let me say, as you can see here, I am meeting with the Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee. I am delighted to be here with them to discuss the budget decisions that have to be made in the next few weeks.

As you know, I strongly favor balancing the budget to lift the burden of debt off of our children and to strengthen our economy. But I think we have to do it in a way that is consistent with our values, giving people the chance to make the most of their own lives, strengthening our families, protecting our children, honoring our parents, growing the middle class, and shrinking the under class. Those are the values that we ought to be making these decisions on.

In my judgment, the congressional budget that the Republican majority has offered violates those values. And the American people need to be a part of this, and they need to ask some basic questions: Do we want to support that budget when it will deny 300,000 elderly people the right to be in nursing homes that they have today? Do we really want to eliminate all the quality standards for nursing homes?

What about—can anybody remember what it was like to go in those places when there were no quality standards? Do we really want to tax 17 million working families and put millions of them back into poverty even though they're working? Do we want to say to a woman whose husband has to go to a nursing home, "In order for your husband to qualify for any assistance you have to sell your car, your house; you have to spend all your life savings; you have to be totally impoverished"? And do we want to let corporations loot their pension funds and compromise the retirement of their workers' fu-

ture? How can we forget—it just was a couple of years ago when we had all these pension funds going broke. Do we really want to go and make that mistake all over again? Now, this budget does all those things. Those are the choices.

I have offered the Congress a budget that balances the budget without destroying education, without undermining our commitment to the environment and without violating our commitments to working families, the elderly, and poor children.

It seems to me that we have to ask these questions. We have to move beyond the level of rhetoric to the values that are embodied in the choices that are being made. And I want to see us make the right choices for America. We need to balance the budget, but we need to do it in a way that strengthens our families, strengthens opportunity, and honors our obligations. That's the only way to help this country, and I am determined to see that we work together to do that in the next few weeks.

Ross Perot

Q. Mr. President, what do you think about Ross Perot's decision to form a third party?

Congressman. Give us a break, will you? [Laughter]

Q. How about the President?

The President. I try to balance the budget, and I'm an ardent promoter of political reform, as you know. But he'll have to do whatever he wants to do, and the American people can make their judgment.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:20 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Teleconference Remarks to the United Mine Workers *September 26, 1995*

Thank you. Thank you, President Trumka, for that great introduction; and thank all of you for that wonderful welcome you just gave me. I got to know your president, Rich Trumka, well in 1992, when we were campaigning together in Pennsylvania, and I learned that we have a lot in common. He's

a kid from a small town, born just after the end of World War II. He still likes fifties rock and roll. He's the first person in his family to go to college and to law school. And when he first ran for president, nobody but his mother thought he had a chance. But he kept plugging away in that modest, low-key way of his, and look where he is today. I'm also glad to be where he is today, and with him.

I also want to acknowledge another friend from 1992, who helped show me around West Virginia, your vice president, Cecil Roberts, and your great secretary-treasurer, Jerry Jones, of Illinois. I'm sorry I couldn't be with you in person, but I am there in spirit.

From your founding 105 years ago, the members of the United Mine Workers have always been the shock-troops of American labor. And I'm proud we're fighting today for the same things. If your brave founders could be with you today, they'd find another time of great change and great challenge for American workers. At the end of the 19th century, when your union got started, America was first entering the industrial age. Now we're the world's leading industrial power, and we're moving full-speed ahead into the global economy. Once again, we're challenged to make great decisions—decisions that will shape the lives of our children and our children's children.

The industrial age brought us great opportunities, to be sure, but it also brought us child labor, the sweatshops, the company towns and the company stores, and the working men and women in our factories who grew old before their time, with injured bodies and broken spirits. That's why we built strong unions in our country, and we built a caring Government to help Americans make the most of their own lives, and to protect them from abuses from which they could not protect themselves. The unions build the middle class, and the middle class built America on the American dream.

Now we find ourselves at another moment of great change. Even as we still depend upon the industrial might of coal miners and other workers, all of you know we're moving into an age characterized by information and technology and this new global economy that

links more of us together economically but also presents extraordinary new pressures on ordinary working people everywhere.

Our challenge is to recognize and embrace new ideas to preserve our vision for the future, a vision of high opportunity where the middle class is growing and the under class is shrinking, people have the opportunities to live up to their own God-given abilities, and families and communities have the ability to solve their own problems. We've got to hold on to that vision by holding on to the values which have always made this country great: freedom and responsibility; work and family; opportunity and the idea that we are, as my friend Governor Chiles of Florida said the other day, we are a community, not a crowd.

Now, a crowd is a collection of people who occupy the same space, just elbowing one another until the strongest and most powerful win, without regard of what happens to the others. A community is a group of people who occupy the same space, who believe that they're going up or down together, and that they have responsibilities to one another. The United Mine Workers has helped to keep America a community, and I thank you for that.

You know, that's what this budget debate is really all about in Washington, whether the America of the 21st century will be a community, as we want it to be, or a crowd, as so many in the Republican majority in Congress want it to be. We need to stop looking for ways to be divided and start looking for ways to reach common ground and higher ground. We've got to be forward-thinking enough to stand up for the future, even if it's not popular in the present. But we've got to be sensible enough to hold on to those core values which have made this country what it is.

The debate about the balanced budget is the biggest case in point. Let me be clear, I strongly favor balancing the budget, to lift the burden of debt off our children and to strengthen our economy. But I think we have to do it in a way that is consistent with those basic values. We've got to give people a chance to make the most of their own lives. We've got to strengthen our families; we've got to protect our children; we must honor our parents. We have to do things that will

grow the middle class and shrink the under class, not increase the insecurity of working families.

These are the values we ought to be making decisions on about the budget. In my judgment, the congressional budget that the Republican majority has offered violates those values. We, the American people, need to be a part of this. We need to ask them basic questions. When we look at their budget, do we really want to support a budget that will deny 300,000 elderly people the right to be in the nursing homes they have today? Do we really want to eliminate all those quality standards for nursing homes? Can't anybody remember what it was like to go in those places when there were no quality standards? Do we really want to tax 17 million working families, increasing taxes on them to the point that many of them will be put back into poverty, even though they're working, and take that money and give a tax break to upper income people who don't need it, and most of whom haven't asked for it?

Do we really want to say to a woman whose husband has to go to a nursing home that "in order for your husband to qualify for any Government assistance, you have to sell your car, your house; you have to spend all your life savings; you have to be totally impoverished"? Do we really want to make it harder for poor young children to get off to a good start in school? Do we want to make it harder for our schools to have smaller classes and computers, even in the poor areas? Do we want to make it more costly for young people to get college loans?

Do we want to make fewer and fewer scholarships available so that more and more young people won't go to college and won't get good jobs with growing incomes? And do we want to let corporations loot their pension funds and compromise the retirement of their workers' future? How can we forget—it was just a couple of years ago—when we had all these pension funds going broke? Just last December, I signed a bill that we passed through the last Congress to save the pensions of 8½ million American workers and stabilize the pensions of 40 million more. Now, do we want to go along with the congressional budget plan to let corporations go

and make that same mistake all over again and to loot their pension funds legally?

Now, this budget does all those things. Those are the choices. If you want their budget in 7 years, with their tax cut and their assumptions and their plan, those are the choices in that budget. But there is another way. I have offered Congress a plan that balances the budget without destroying education, without undermining our commitment to the environment, and without violating our commitments to working families, the elderly, and our children.

The budget debate forces us to answer a simple question: Do we want a Government that upholds our values as a community and stands on the side of working people, struggling to build better lives for themselves? I think the answer is yes. And that is exactly what I have been working to do.

Two and a half years ago, you sent me to Washington to generate jobs, increase income, shrink the under class, grow the middle class, give America a better, stronger future. Since I started my job, our economy has created more than 7 million new jobs, 2½ million new homeowners, 2 million new small businesses. Unemployment is down 20 percent. We're also cutting the deficit. You know, the deficit was \$290 billion when we started. It's down to \$160 billion now. That's a 40 percent cut; a cut for 3 years in a row, the best performance since Harry Truman was President.

But you know better than anyone that we have a lot more to do to make sure America keeps working for and not against working families. That's why I fought for the passage of the Family and Medical Leave Act. That's why we gave a tax cut to 14 million working families with incomes under \$28,000. That's why I support an increase in the minimum wage. That's why I proposed a new "GI bill for America's workers," to give people a check or a voucher when they're unemployed or underemployed, so they can take the money and take it to a local community college or any other training program for up to 2 years to get the kind of training they decide they need.

When people lose their jobs in this country today, too often the rest of our people walk away from them. And that's wrong. Our ad-

ministration is pro-family, pro-worker, and pro-union. Right after I took office, I got rid of my predecessor's antiworker, antiunion Executive orders that weakened unions from public service to private industry.

With an Executive order this spring, our administration said in no uncertain terms that we won't allow companies that do business with the Government to permanently replace striking workers. We want to make sure that if you're forced to exercise your right to strike, you won't be fired for it. Make no mistake about it, we believe collective bargaining is a right and firing striking workers is wrong.

I've often spoken about how America has to keep faith with the people who work hard and play by the rules. That means we must honor our obligations to those who risk their lives to go beneath the earth and mine our coal. Your workplace is unique. It can change in an instant from one of safety to one of danger. That's why we need to keep the Mine Safety and Health Administration and maintain it as a separate agency.

Under the outstanding leadership of Secretary Reich and Davitt McAteer, MSHA is enforcing the law, protecting workers, and saving lives. You know better than anyone that in the 25 years since Congress passed the Mine Safety Act, the deaths in the coal mines have decreased by 77 percent. Now there are those in Congress who want to destroy MSHA, to limit inspections in unsafe mines and leave miners out in the cold who dare to blow the whistle and stand up for safety.

Well, there are no coal mines in Washington, DC, and here, sometimes the voice of big money can shout down the voice of the people. That's why it is so important when United Mine Workers miners and Rich Trumka come to the Capital, as they did, to tell why saving MSHA is literally a matter of life and death. And that's why I will fight and fight against any bill to cut or gut MSHA.

Keeping faith with people who have worked hard all their lives also means protecting coal miner retirees' health care, as guaranteed in the Rockefeller Act, also known as the Coal Act. The Coal Act is our country's solemn covenant with more than 100,000 retired miners and their families to

protect their health benefits and their peace of mind. It is not a matter of partisanship. This act was signed into law by President Bush and is supported to this day by the major coal companies.

Yesterday, you heard the author of that act, Senator Jay Rockefeller, explain how it is threatened and how it must be maintained. Today, let me tell you, we're going to fight to preserve your health benefits as guaranteed in the Coal Act.

Let me close by saying that I understand what's at stake as we fight to protect the health and safety of coal miners. When I was a young lawyer in Arkansas, just out of law school, back in the early 1970's, I handled several black lung cases for retired coal miners who could breathe only with great difficulty after a lifetime in the mines.

Some of the folks from MSHA found a letter that was found on the body of a coal miner who died in a mine explosion in Tennessee. Although a barricade held out the bad air for over 7 hours, the trapped miners eventually succumbed to the suffocating gas. Here is what the miner, Jacob Vowell, wrote to his wife, Ellen:

"Ellen, darling, goodbye for us both. We're all praying for air to support us, but it's getting bad without any air.

"Ellen, I want you to live right and come to heaven. Raise the children as best you can. Oh, how I wish to be with you. It's 25 minutes after 2. There are a few of us alive yet. Oh, God, for one more breath. Ellen, remember me for as long as you live.

"Goodbye, darling."

That letter was written 93 years ago. Today, thanks to the United Mine Workers, a better America, and the grace of God, our miners are working in greater safety and living with greater dignity.

The future of our Nation depends upon rewarding the efforts of people like you with safety, prosperity, and dignity. You and your families and the millions and millions of working families like you, you are heart and soul of the American dream. We have to keep working together not just to preserve what's been won but to continue to fight for better jobs, better wages, and more justice.

The 21st century can be America's greatest time. Our children and our grandchildren

can enjoy more freedom, more opportunity if we do what is right. But we can't let the people in Washington who are trying to do it, turn back the clock. We have to keep America moving forward, strong, proud, and united, in the words of your own banner. Let's stay that way and march into the 21st century victorious for the values of ordinary Americans.

God bless you, and thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke by satellite at 2:15 p.m. from Room 459 in the Old Executive Office Building to the United Mine Workers convention in Miami, FL.

Remarks at the Swearing-In of Mark Gearan as Director of the Peace Corps

September 26, 1995

Well, Mark, congratulations to you and your family; to all the Members of Congress who are here and other former Peace Corps volunteers and others.

I have always been impressed by many things about the Peace Corps, one of which is the contributions made by Peace Corps volunteers after they come home. Senator Dodd was a member of the Peace Corps. Congressman Farr was a member of the Peace Corps. Donna Shalala served in the Peace Corps. The Vice President's beloved sister, Nancy Gore Hunger, was one of the first two people to join the Peace Corps, working with Sarge Shriver, all those years ago.

And it is a remarkable tradition that emphasizes that our country is about more than power and wealth. It is also about the power of our values and the power of a helping hand, and the ethic of service, and the understanding that we have an obligation not only to our own people but to people around the world to help them make the most of their own lives, and that the best guarantee of peace and freedom and democracy is the ability of people, freely, to develop their God-given capacities to strengthen their families and see their communities succeed. That's really what the Peace Corps is all about.

It is the symbol of everything that got my generation into public service. And it has animated a whole generation of people. It is the inspiration for so much of the service that goes on today, whether it is in the AmeriCorps program that was started in our administration or—I just came from taping a public service announcement for Nickelodeon, the children's television network. One year ago this week, I asked the children in Nickelodeon to volunteer to do community service. And 5 million-plus of them did so by telephone. They called in and actually served. And so this year, we're trying to increase. These are grade-school children by and large.

So this whole ethic of service that has spread across our country in part is inspired by and defined by the work that was begun so many years ago by President Kennedy and by Sargent Shriver. I think it's really fitting that Mark Gearan should be here in this program inspired by President Kennedy. I mean, look around at this family, and notice that Father Leo O'Donovan—operative word, O'Donovan—the president of Georgetown is here. Notice—I was wondering how Mark got so much bipartisan support. Look at the chairman of the committee, Chairman Callahan—[laughter]—and Peter King—King, in this case, is a very Irish name. [Laughter]

As a matter of fact, Mark said, "Mr. President, I love the Peace Corps just the way it is. I only have one serious change I want to make. I think we should send 6,500 of the 7,000 volunteers to Ireland." [Laughter]

Congressman Moran, we're glad you're here. And Congresswoman Pelosi, we're certainly glad you're here to show that we're not trying to ethnically purify the Peace Corps here. [Laughter]

The Peace Corps is really the reflection of our better selves, isn't it? And one of the reasons we're all so happy to see Mark Gearan become the Director of it is that, on most days, he is the reflection of our better selves. We wish him well. We love him. We respect him, and we know that he will do great honor to this very important position for the United States and for all the good-hearted people of the entire world.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 3:20 p.m. in the Indian Treaty Room of the Old Executive Office Building.

Remarks on the Peace Process in Bosnia and an Exchange With Reporters

September 26, 1995

The President. Good afternoon. I have just spoken with Secretary Christopher and the rest of our negotiating team in New York, and I am pleased to announce another positive step on the path to peace in Bosnia. The Foreign Ministers of Bosnia, Serbia, and Croatia have endorsed a set of further agreed basic principles for an overall settlement to the war, building on the agreement they reached in Geneva on September 8th.

These principles spell out in greater detail the constitutional structures of the state of Bosnia, including the establishment of a national Presidency, a Parliament, and a constitutional court. They commit the parties to hold free and democratic elections under international supervision. And they further provide that a central government will be responsible for conducting Bosnia's foreign policy, as well as other key functions that are still being discussed.

The American people must realize that there are many difficult obstacles still to overcome along the path to peace. There is no guarantee of success. But today's step—today's agreement moves us closer to the ultimate goal of a genuine peace, and it makes clear that Bosnia will remain a single internationally recognized state. America will strongly oppose the partition of Bosnia, and America will continue working for peace.

We hope the progress we are making finally reflects the will of the parties to end this terrible war. We know it's a result of the international community's resolve and a determined diplomacy on the part of our negotiating team and our European and Russian partners.

I have instructed our team to return to the Balkans on Thursday to press forward in the search for peace. If and when the parties reach a settlement, America should help to secure it. The path to a lasting peace in Bosnia remains long and difficult, but we are

making progress, and we are determined to succeed.

As you know now, our team in New York will have a press conference, and they will be able to answer your more detailed questions about the specifics of the agreement.

Thank you.

Q. What about your response to Senator Dole, Mr. President?

Q. What else has to be decided?

Q. What about that letter that Senator Dole sent you yesterday?

The President. Well, I intend to write him a response and to make it available. But remember, I have said since February of 1993—since February of 1993—constantly, for more than 2½ years now, that the United States should participate in implementing a peace agreement. We should not have ground troops on the ground, under the present U.N. mandate. We should not have ground troops on the ground in combat.

But the United States is the leader of NATO. No peace agreement could be fairly implemented without the involvement of NATO, and we cannot walk away from our responsibility to try to end this terrible conflict, not only for the people of Bosnia but for what it means for ultimate peace throughout the Balkans and the ultimate security of the United States and the ultimate avoiding of war and involvement by the United States. And that has been my position for 2½ years.

We have had several congressional consultations about it, and of course, as developments proceed here, if there is a peace and we have a good implementation agreement that I believe the United States should be a part of, I will, of course, extensively further consult with Congress.

But this has been my public position, well-known, and members of the press corps have asked me about it now for more than 2½ years. And it will continue to be my position, and I will continue to consult with Congress.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:50 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Remarks at a Saxophone Club Fundraiser

September 26, 1995

Well, if I had any sense, I would quit while I'm ahead. *[Laughter]* I believe Terry's about to get the hang of this. *[Laughter]*

I want to thank Terry McAuliffe for the magnificent job that he has done, along with Laura Hartigan and all of our staff. I want to thank Sean, who thought up the idea of the Saxophone Club in his office about 3 years ago. And it, I think you could say, has sort of caught on, thanks to you. And I appreciate that. I thank you. I thank Matt and all the people who have worked hard to make the Saxophone Club a success.

This, in some ways, is my favorite part of the campaign, the Saxophone Club, because a lot of you have come here and have contributed, and it hasn't been easy for you. But those of you who have joined the Saxophone Club who are basically in Sean's generation—some a little younger, maybe some a little older—you're the people that I ran for President for. I wanted so badly to see our country go into the next century still the strongest country in the world, the strongest force for peace and freedom and democracy, the American dream alive and well here at home, and with people coming together instead of being split apart. That's why I ran, and that's why I'm running for reelection.

I think every day of what I want this country to look like 10, 20, 30 years from now when your children are coming up and growing up and looking forward to their futures. I want this to be a country with great opportunity for entrepreneurs; a country where we can, through hard work, grow the middle class and shrink the under class; a country with good schools and a clean environment and safe streets; a country that is characterized by fairness, not meanness, and by unity, not division.

We're having this great debate in Washington now which is more extreme in the options being discussed than has been the case in previous times. And part of it is because we're going through a period of change, and whenever we go through a period of change,

extreme debates tend to arise and old alliances tend to get unsettled.

But the fundamental questions are clear: How are we going to get into the 21st century, rewarding the values that made America great with the new ideas that are always required in a time of change? How are we going to reward both freedom and responsibility? How are we going to lift up both work and family? How are we going to empower individuals to make the most of their own lives and families and communities to solve their own problems? How are we going to honor our obligations across the generations to our parents and our children, across our racial and ethnic lines, across our income lines?

Fundamentally, we have to decide, as my friend Lawton Chiles, the Governor of Florida, said the other day, whether we're going to be a community or a crowd. You think about it. That's what the fairness and meanness debate is all about. It's also about whether you believe that you will do better in the 21st century if you live in a community or a crowd.

You obviously have decided you want to live in a community, even though most of you could do pretty well in a crowd. A crowd is a group of people occupying the same space who basically have no rules and they can just elbow each other until the strongest prevail and the weak are left behind. A community is a group of people occupying the same space who believe that their success and meaning and richness in life depends upon other people's success as well, that we go up or down together and, therefore, we have certain obligations to one another and to our land and to our future.

I want this country to be a community, not a crowd. I want it to be a country where huge opportunity exists for individuals but where we do it with fairness and not meanness. That's basically what this debate is all about now.

When I look to the future, I see an economic policy that has worked. My friends in the other party, they all said if my economic plan passed it would be the end of the world; we'd have the awfulest recession you ever saw. I keep waiting for all those fellows who want to be President in the Republican pri-

mary to be just quoted back what they said about our economic plan in '93. [Laughter] Where are they? Sooner or later we should stop rewarding people for being wrong, wrong, wrong every time.

But in spite of everything Terry said, in spite of the fact that we had over 7 million new jobs and 2½ million new homeowners and 2 million new small businesses and the largest number of self-made millionaires than any time period in history that's comparable and a 4,700 stock market—the median wage dropped. So if we're going to be a community, not a crowd, we have to find a way to give everybody a shot at the American dream, which means that we should invest more money in education and research and development and new technologies, not less. We should give everybody a chance to go forward.

If we really believe in responsibility along with opportunity and along with freedom, then we have to believe in safe streets and a clean environment; we have to believe in child support enforcement; we have to believe in genuine welfare reform which rewards work and parenting, instead of punishing children. If we really believe in that.

I am proud of the fact that, since our crime bill passed—the same crowd, you know, they said if the President's crime bill passes, he claims there will be 100,000 police in 6 years, but they'll never get to 20,000. Well, in the first year we're over 25,000 and rising. And I keep hoping somebody will ask them about what they said. Maybe I'll get a chance to one day. But I'm proud of that. I'm proud of the fact that we have stiffened child support enforcement. I'm proud of the fact that we have cracked down on fraud in the Medicare and Medicaid and food stamp programs. I am proud of the fact that we have done the things we've done. We've had the first conviction this week under the Violence Against Women Act. We've begun to convict people under the "three strikes and you're out" bill. I'm proud of that.

And I am proud of the fact that we seem to be coming back to our senses in many ways as a society. In every State just about, the crime rate's down, the murder rate's down, the welfare rolls are down, the food stamp rolls are down. The teen pregnancy rate is

down in America 2 years in a row now. Even the divorce rate is down. We seem to be coming back together.

But it's just like on the economic side. The drug use rate is down for people over 18, but among young children, between 12 and 17, the rate of random violence and random drug use is up again. So we have to keep doing what works, but we have to also have an agenda for those young people, which means we shouldn't abandon a crime bill that is working with both prevention and preventive policing. It means we shouldn't cut out things like summer jobs and other programs designed to give these kids something to say yes to, instead of just something to say no to. It means we shouldn't walk away from our commitment to safe and drug-free schools and giving these children access to role models that give them a chance to make something positive of their lives. Because a lot of them are just out there kind of raising themselves, and they've been kind of cut loose. And we can't walk away from them.

If you look at what we have tried to do in the way we run our Government—our adversaries, they always talked about big Government and how they wanted to do something about it. But there are 163,000 fewer people working for the National Government today than there were the day I took office. We have downsized the Government. We took 16,000 pages of regulation away. We reduced SBA regulations, for example, by 50 percent, and the budget by 40 percent, and doubled the loan volume including an 85-percent increase in loans to women and a 75-percent increase in loans to minorities, without making one single loan below our normal standards. We did those things.

So I'm all for that. But there's still work to be done. We still have to say there are some things as a community we do through our Nation that we don't want to just leave alone. In the world, I'm proud of the foreign policy accomplishments that Terry mentioned. I'm glad for what happened here in Bosnia today with the new agreement. And I am glad that on Thursday we will have a second signing between Israel and the Palestinians, moving forward on peace in the Middle East.

But we are still vulnerable in our country to the forces of organized destruction, from terrorism and religious and ethnic and racial hatred and fanaticism. So there's more to do. We've got an antiterrorism bill to pass. I was told that bill would pass by Memorial Day, and I am still waiting for it. We still have things to do to make the world a better place.

I want a comprehensive nuclear test ban. I want the chemical weapons treaty to pass. I want the START II treaty to pass. I want us to have ultimate real peace in Bosnia and in Northern Ireland. I want the world to be moving in the right direction so that you will have less chaos and madness to deal with. And I want the United Nations and NATO to work. That means the United States has to lead.

All those things are issues. But they're all rooted in whether we want to be a community or a crowd, whether we want to reward responsibility as well as freedom, whether we want to reward opportunity for individuals and strength for families and communities. And that's really what this debate about the budget is. It's really not much about money, it's about what kind of people we're going to be.

We have proved—I have given the Congress a budget that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve says is credible, based on economic estimates that have been more accurate than those of Congress in the previous 2 years. It is a good, solid budget. But this is not about balancing the budget. Both parties agreed now we should balance the budget, and we should. The Democrats should never be in the position of being for a permanent deficit. We never had one until the 12 years before I showed up here.

But let balanced budgeting be a goal in and of itself, done consistent with our values. Don't use the balanced budget as an excuse to destroy programs that you don't like that will make us more uneven, less healthy, undermine our environment and weaken our community. Let's do it in the right way.

When I learned, for example, that among the proposals in this budget is a gimmick to make the cost of college loans more expensive to students and to take away options that students have to repay those loans so that bankers and other middle men can get more

money back—that's not about cutting the budget; that's about our values. If we want to grow the economy by cutting the budget, why would we undermine economic growth by taking college out of the reach of more and more Americans? It doesn't make sense. It's not consistent with our values.

Why would we make it harder for little poor children to get off to a good start in school or for districts that don't have so much money to have smaller classes and more computers and higher standards? Those children may not be your children, but they'll be a big part of your future, because when those of you who are young or my age, they will be who you'll be looking at to care for you, to strengthen your country, to drive us forward. We have to be thinking about 20 years, 30 years down the road. This is not a smart thing to do. And it violates our values as well as our interests.

If you look at the environment, my idea of balancing the budget does not include gutting the EPA so they can't enforce the Clean Air Act. This administration—not the previous Republican administration, this administration—has gone to big industries and said, "Look, if you can meet the standards of the Clean Air Act and you're willing to be tested for it, you can throw the rule book away. We're tired of over-regulating America. We just want a clean environment, and we'll look for ways to get it." Our administration has gone in partnership to Detroit and other automotive interests and said, we will work with you to develop a clean car, but we have to triple the auto mileage that we're going to get out of our automobiles. And we have to do it soon, otherwise the greenhouse gas emissions from all this automobile driving around the world is going to choke the future.

We have to do it. But we did it in a partnership. I could give you example after example after example. But to jump in the tank and claim that the environment doesn't matter anymore? You see, just last week, we had a new scientific report that said now there is virtually unanimity among all the established scientists in the world that the globe is heating up, that the hole in the ozone layer is bigger than we thought, that if we could—we could see the temperature of the Earth

grow up to 8 degrees in the next hundred years. If you do that, you'll have the polar ice caps breaking up; you'll have the water level rising; you'll have temperature extremes going wacky. And the world will be a very different world for your great-grandchildren.

We cannot let that happen. We don't have to let that happen. We owe it to our country to preserve our heritage. And we sure don't need a commission on closing the national parks, which is another part of their budget. It's wrong.

I grew up in one of those little national parks they say they want to close. And I can tell you we had a lot of elderly people coming down and retiring in our hometown from the Middle West, living in little rooming houses, barely had enough money to live on. They came there because of the national park, because of what it offered, because they could for no money be in 5 minutes from downtown in peaceful, beautiful surroundings. And they can have access to the sulphur springs and all the other things that were there. And that story is replicated all over America.

When our family went to Yellowstone and Grand Teton this summer, and we drove through there for 10 bucks—for 10 bucks, our family could go through there and visit the national park, just like any other family. For \$25 you can get a year pass, and your car can get into any national park in America. [*Laughter*] Now, listen, we're laughing, but there are a lot of Americans who haven't had a pay raise in 15 years; they can still have the dignity and the rest and the exhilaration of seeing the most beautiful places on God's Earth at an affordable price because your country has the national parks.

My idea of balancing the budget does not include a Medicare program where, as they told us in both Houses in the last week, we want to double the deductibles, double the premiums, not give anybody Medicare until they're 67, and, oh, by the way, in Medicaid we're going to abolish all the national standards for nursing homes—signed into law by Ronald Reagan, hardly a liberal Democrat—[*Laughter*—we're going to get rid of all them, and we're going to adopt a rule that says before an elderly person can get any help, if they're married, the State has the

right to make their spouse sell the car, the house, and clean out the savings account and live in abject poverty.

That is not the America I want you to live in in the 21st century. It is wrong. I don't want you to live in that America. I don't want you to be living in Maryland making a living and have your parents in Indiana or some other place out there in the country and worried to death because there are no national quality standards for nursing homes if your parents have to be there. I don't want you to have to work that way. That's not right, and it's not necessary. I don't want that.

And I'll tell you something else: Look at what happened to working families this week in this budget. They proposed to cut my taxes but to just erode the working family tax credit that we put in, so that they're going to raise taxes on families with incomes of less than \$25,000 a year to lower mine. No, thank you. That's not right. That's not pro-work. It's not pro-family. It's not good for America. It is not right. It is not right. How can you do that?

I'm telling you, there are a huge number of American families out there where there's one or two parents, where people are working full-time, where they have children in the home and they're living on \$11,000, \$12,000, \$13,000, \$15,000, \$16,000 a year. It is all they can do to educate their children and put clothes on their back and make sure they get to the doctor if they're sick. It is all they can do.

And in 1993, when we passed our economic plan, we lowered taxes on 14 million of those families—with 50 million Americans in them—because we wanted always to encourage work over welfare and because we wanted to have an elemental principle in our country: If you're a parent and you're trying to be a good parent, and you're willing to work 40 hours a week, you should not be in poverty. That is right, and we should say this.

And let me tell you something else that you may not know about their budget. They voted this week to say that a company keeping a retirement plan can deposit money into workers' retirement funds and then take it out and spend it for whatever they want, for whatever they want. As long as they leave

a minor and inadequate cushion there, you can put money into your workers' retirement and then take it out and spend it on whatever you want.

Is there no memory? Just last December, just last December I signed a bill to strengthen our national pension benefit guaranty system. It saved the pensions of 8.5 million Americans. It secured the pensions of 40 million other Americans. Have we no memory? We just saw people losing their whole retirement. Now they propose to let people loot their workers' pension plans for whatever reason? Take it out of the pension and give it in dividends. Take it out of the pension and give it to managers in extra pay, for a third home or something.

Let me say this: I want people to do well in this country. I am proud of the fact that under our administration, we've had record numbers of new businesses and record numbers of self-made millionaires. And I want every one of you who wants to be a millionaire or a successful entrepreneur to do it. But we don't have to hurt the rest of America. This is a middle class country with middle class values, committed to families and children and their parents and doing right by everybody. We don't have to hurt people to do that. We don't have to.

So I say to you, it is about values. And it's also about leadership, and leadership includes making policies like this based on principle, not mere politics—based on principle, not mere politics—and being willing to do certain things that are unpopular. You heard Terry reel off a few of them. The conventional wisdom was that we shouldn't take on the NRA over the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. You all clapped and cheered, but the Democrats lost the House because of it, don't you ever forget it. There were a lot of people who laid down their careers so that last year, 40,000 people with criminal records would not be able to get handguns. And they did because there were actually people out there who were willing to frighten good, God-fearing Americans who owned guns and engage in sporting contests; and actually convinced them that that threatened their weapons. It didn't, and they knew it, but they did it anyway. And yes, they won a short-term political battle, but there are

more people alive today because of that. There are more people alive today because we're going to take those assault weapons out of the schools and off the streets. And nobody's going to lose the right to have a hunting weapon or a sporting weapon.

And everybody says that this tobacco thing is going to be chapter two of the same thing. They'll terrify all those good, God-fearing tobacco farmers into thinking that we're going to put them in the street. They'll try to convince people that Big Brother, the Government's going to take over these decisions. And maybe it's bad politics, but let me tell you something, folks. You know what the 14-month study by the FDA showed? It showed that, number one, there were some people in the industry who had known for decades about the dangers of tobacco and how addictive it was; number two, that there was advertising still having a heavy attraction for children. And since they lose a certain number of customers every year, they've got to get a few more. *[Laughter]* And number three—you're laughing, but it's true. Number three showed that of the 3,000 young people a day who begin to smoke 1,000 will have their lives shortened. Now, if we can give 1,000 kids a day, for the next however many months I've got to be President—you know, whether it's 64 or some less—a thousand people a day—it's worth the political consequences. For the long run it is the right thing to do.

But there are lots of other examples where I have to do what I think is right. I knew the Haiti thing was unpopular, but it was right. And we're in better shape in Latin America and the world, and democracy's in better shape because we restored democracy to Haiti, and because of the way we did it without having to kill a bunch of them or our people as well. It was the right thing to do, even if it wasn't popular in the moment.

I can see it now building up. In Bosnia, you know every—people say, well, we like the fact that now our allies decided to go along with our strategy, and we did the strong and right thing in Bosnia, and now we have a chance to make peace. But if we make peace, because we're the world's leader and because we're the leader of NATO, we'll have the same obligation here we had when

Egypt and Israel made peace in the late seventies. We have to help enforce that.

We never lost a person in the Sinai as a result of the Middle East peace. And if we have a good peace agreement here, in all probability none of our soldiers will be put in harm's way. But there will be people who try to stir folks up and say it's a bad thing to do. But if you want your country to be a leader for peace and freedom, we cannot say, "We're the leader; here's what you should do; now, you go do it." We've got to—we have to show up for work in the morning. We have to.

I could give you lots of other examples. I knew, when I gave my affirmative action speech, I know what the politics of that is. But I'm nearly 50 years old. I have lived through the worst of racial segregation in this country. I was raised by a working grandmother and a working mother, and I have seen women's opportunities expand and discrimination continue. I know in my own mind that we are not yet able to fully make decisions, all of us, totally disregarding the gender and race of the people with whom we deal. Now, that doesn't mean that we don't have to fix affirmative action, there weren't a bunch of things wrong with it that we need to clean up and deal with. And I'm trying to do that.

The popular thing is just say get rid of it. But it's not the right thing. The right thing is for us to band together and to grow together. Our ethnic diversity, and the fact that we are willing to give all of our people, regardless of their gender, a chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities, is our meal ticket in the global society of the 21st century, if we can live together instead of using cheap politics to drive each other apart. It is our meal ticket.

So I say to you, when people ask you why you're involved in this campaign and why you're fighting for my reelection, say, "I'm not fighting for the President; I'm fighting for myself and my children and my future and my country. That's what I'm interested in."

When people ask you why they should support this campaign, you can tell them what Terry did about our record. And I hope you will become familiar with it. And I hope you

will be able to say that. But the real thing is, what are we going to do tomorrow to make it better? We've got to have a strong economy. We've got to have strong families. We've got to have good individual opportunity. We have to have a Government that is leaner and makes more sense. We have to be leaders in the world.

But most important, if we want the 21st century to look right, we've got to stand up for responsibility as well as freedom, for family and for work, and for the elemental proposition that the reason we're around here after more than 200 years is that at all critical junctures we have deepened our understanding and our willingness to act on what it means to be a community instead of a crowd.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:05 p.m. at the Omni Shoreham Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Terry McAuliffe, national finance chairman, and Laura Hartigan, national finance director, Clinton/Gore '96; and Sean Foley, chairman, and Matt Gobush, director, Saxophone Club.

Remarks to Oklahoma City "Thank You America" Participants

September 27, 1995

Thank you, Governor Keating. I want to thank so many people who are here who made me immensely proud to be an American and to have the opportunity to serve during this sad but amazing episode in our Nation's history.

First, I thank Governor Keating for his outstanding leadership. It's a little-known fact, but about 30 years ago in this city, Frank Keating and I were college classmates. And life took us in different directions and to different parties and different pursuits. But when I watched him during this crisis, I saw the same person I had admired 30 years ago and had felt good about, about his strength and his eloquence and his conviction. And the people of Oklahoma were very fortunate to have him as their Governor during this period. I thank Mrs. Keating for the work she did, especially on that memorial service which will live in the minds and hearts of every one of us who participated in it, and I imagine every American who saw it, for as

long as we live. I thank Mayor Norick and Mrs. Norick. I saw the mayor earlier, and the first time I talked to him and then when I came down to see him, I thought, of all the things you ever imagined could happen to you when you run for mayor, this is the one thing you never signed on for. But I think that he and his representatives here from the police and fire department and the people from the Oklahoma National Guard and the Oklahoma Emergency Management Agency who are represented here did a very, very fine job.

I think you saw once again, when my old friend James Lee Witt was up here talking about it—he lives this job more than anybody who has ever headed the Federal Emergency Management Agency. And I think he has done great credit to that agency, and he's made America feel secure in times of trouble, whatever the trouble is. And I thank him for that.

I want to say to Mr. Stinnette and the people from Fairfax County, Mr. Mathais and the people from Virginia Beach, Lieutenant Carr and the people from Montgomery County, and all the brave men and women who answered the call, I thank you very much. Let me also thank the Governor and the mayor for bringing our new Miss America here. I thought she did magnificently well in the contest the other night. Congratulations to you. We're glad to see you here.

It is a tribute to the leadership and to the strength of Oklahomans that in the midst of their own continuing recovery, they took the trouble and time to come here and tour this country to thank those of you who assisted them in their hour of need. As I said at the time, and I want to say again, one of the lessons of the Oklahoma City tragedy is that, although they lost a very great deal, they did not lose America. They have not forgotten that. And I really appreciated what the Governor said when he said that if any of us ever needed them, they would be there.

I was in Florida the other day, walking the streets of Jacksonville in a high-crime area with a man who had just been elected sheriff. And we had a lot of children there who were living there in this neighborhood. And in the last 6 months, they've been able to drive the crime rate down dramatically. And the Gov-

ernor of Florida said, "You know, one of the continuing struggles in America is for us to decide whether we're going to be a community or a crowd." He said, "A crowd of people occupy the same piece of land, but they don't really relate to each other very well. They just kind of shove each other back and forth, and some win and some are left behind. A community occupies the same piece of land, and they recognize that they really are obligated to one another, and that everybody's life is better when they recognize those obligations and act on them."

Oklahoma City turned the entire United States into a community. In fact, it turned us all into a family. We somehow found our better selves in the horror of what had happened to people with whom we identified. The feelings of the rescuers, I think, is best summed up in a note I got from the Fairfax County team. And they wrote:

We'll never forget our time in Oklahoma City. We still are healing and searching for the reason why someone could do something this evil to people that are so good. Now, whenever we find ourselves angry over something, we think about the people of Oklahoma and our anger abates. Whenever we're asked about what we did there, the answer always includes meeting the most wonderful people in the country. We'd like to thank the people of Oklahoma City for reminding us of what being an American really means.

No one could have said it better than the team. Thank you very much.

One of the best things we can do to continue this healing process is to all carry on as best we can with the work that was left undone there, to reach out to the children, especially those who lost a parent or whose parents were severely disabled by the bombing.

America believes in extending a helping hand to people who are in trouble through no fault of their own. And a lot of things have been announced to help those children and those families. We have established a scholarship fund here, and various Federal agencies are working on making sure that the children of people who were killed who worked for the agencies will all be able to go on to college and have their educational needs met. And so we decided to establish

a Presidential scholarship fund to assist the children of the victims.

One of the nicest things that's happened to me in the last 3 years is that this year on my birthday, the present my staff gave to me was that each of them contributed to the scholarship fund for the children of Oklahoma City. Since there will be many different circumstances for these young people, we thought it best to set up an advisory board to direct the proceeds of the scholarship fund. And my long-time friend former Governor George Nigh, has agreed to chair it. Former Governor and Senator Henry Bellman has agreed to serve on the board. We will be assisted by the Governor's office and the Mayor's office. And James Lee Witt has also agreed to serve on the board.

So this fund will be administered at absolutely no cost, and therefore, 100 percent of all the contributions given by Federal employees and others here in Washington and throughout the country to help the children will go to educate those children. And I think that is very, very important.

Ghandi once said that if we are ever to reach real peace in this world, we shall have to begin with the children. For those of you who are being honored here today who brought your children, let me thank you for that. I hope they will always remember and always be very proud of what you did for their Nation in the hour of need of the people of Oklahoma City.

Let me now say that I hope and pray that this will never happen again in our country. We are doing everything we can to prevent it from happening again. But we learned something about ourselves when it did happen that we should never forget. And I just hope that we can follow the lesson of the note in the Fairfax County team's statement. When we feel ourselves getting angry or drifting away from our fellow citizens or being less than we ought to be, we ought to remember how all of us were in the aftermath of Oklahoma City and how that magnificent spirit made everyone a little more human, a little more alive, and a lot more proud to just have the opportunity to help our fellow human beings and our fellow Americans who needed it. If we can remem-

ber that, then that lasting tragedy will always have changed America for the better.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:40 p.m. at the National Guard Memorial. In his remarks, he referred to Governor Frank Keating of Oklahoma, and his wife, Cathy; Mayor Ronald Norick of Oklahoma City, OK, and his wife, Carolyn; Edward L. Stinnette, chief, Fairfax County Urban Search and Rescue Task Force; Tom Carr, chief, Montgomery County Urban Search and Rescue Task Force; and Miss America Shawntel Smith.

Remarks to the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute

September 27, 1995

Thank you all. Please be seated. It is wonderful to be here, wonderful to be back. I thank Congressman and Mrs. Pastor for coming out here with me. And I thank Ed for that fine introduction. To your mistress of ceremonies, Giselle Fernandez; members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus; the Institute Board; your executive director, Rita Elizondo; and Secretary Cisneros and Mary Alice; Secretary Peña and Ellen; Secretary Riley and Tunkie; Attorney General Reno; and all your honored guests: I thank you for inviting me to come again this year.

For 18 years you have held this event, and it's become a part of our Nation's important Hispanic Heritage Month. I have been here for 3 years running, and during these 3 years my daughter has been studying Spanish. So I hope you'll keep inviting me back; it's getting a little better each year. How's this? *Y me gusta hablar Español*. Is that okay? [Applause]

I was thinking tonight coming over here—it's not in my prepared remarks, but I was thinking of two connected events that shape what I wish to say to you tonight. The first was the honor I had to be a part of the premiere here a few months ago of that wonderful movie, "Mi Familia." And the second was the experience I had just today to be with the Governor of the State of Oklahoma and Mrs. Keating, and the Mayor of the city of—Oklahoma City, and Mrs. Norick; and a group from Oklahoma as they came here on their national tour, thanking all the volunteer

workers who went to Oklahoma City in the aftermath of the horrible bombing of the Federal building. And what I thought and said there was that, in that moment, we all became a family, the whole country.

In Florida last week, Governor Lawton Chiles said that the central question of our time was whether we were going to be a community or a crowd. The Hispanic community in America has always been a community, always tried to live by family values, not just talk about them. Now, a crowd is a group that occupies the same piece of land but really has no particular connection to one another. And so they elbow and shove and go to and fro until the strongest win and others are left behind. A community is a group of people who occupy the same piece of land and recognize their obligations to one another, people who believe they're going up or down together, people who believe they should help protect children and do honor to the elderly and help people make the most of their own lives, people who believe in freedom and responsibility, people who believe that we have an obligation to find common ground and sometimes to do the right thing because it's right, even if it's unpopular in the short run.

And in this period of change, as we move out of an industrial to an information society, out of the cold war into the global economy, that is what we need more than ever before, the values of your family and your community and your work.

The work of the Hispanic Caucus has never been more important than it is today, because you have stood for the values that are the very heart of the Latino culture and the very best of America. Some seek to divide us by spreading fear and laying blame. But the Hispanic Caucus has always sought to unite us all in America. I have counted on your support, literally from everything from A to Z, from affirmative action to zero tolerance gun policies in our schools.

The Hispanic Caucus has been my partner in 3 years of hard-won progress. When I became President, we had a stagnant and suffering economy. When I proposed a remedy to drive down this terrible deficit and increase investment in our people and in our economy and in our future, the naysayers

who turned away said it would wreck the economy. But with the help of the Hispanic Caucus we passed an economic policy, and after 3 years, they were wrong and we were right.

We have 7.3 million new jobs, 2½ million new homeowners. Secretary Cisneros has a plan that will take homeownership above two-thirds of the American people by the year 2000 for the first time in American history. We have the largest number of new small businesses incorporated in any 2½-year period in American history, about 2 million. We have the largest number of new self-made millionaires in any 2½-year period in American history, and we have the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation in nearly three decades.

The Hispanic Caucus helped this administration to tackle the problem of crime. When I showed up here, for 6 years Washington rhetoric had paralyzed the crime bill while everybody made speeches about it. We broke through that rhetoric and the partisan discord and passed a crime bill at a time when most Americans believed that nothing, nothing, could really be done about the crime problem. Our crime bill put more police officers on our street. It did punish serious criminals more, but it also gave our young people something to say yes to. And in every State in the country now, in virtually every urban area, the crime rate is down, the murder rate is down.

I was in Jacksonville, Florida, last week, and I saw that for the first time, people really believed that crime could go down in their neighborhoods, as they saw these police officers that we have put on the street. Again, we did it in the face of intense partisan opposition, but you were right, and I thank you. And America is a safer place tonight because of the leadership of the Hispanic Caucus.

Last year at the Summit of the Americas, we saw what a vital role Hispanic-Americans can play as we expand trade with all of Latin America, through NAFTA and the free trade area we agreed on by the year 2005. When Mexico got in trouble, so many of you stood by my side in what had the least popular support of anything I think I've done since I've been President.

But think what would have happened if we had not gone to Mexico's aid. Look what was happening in Mexico. Look what was happening in Argentina. Look what was happening in Brazil. Look what would have happened in terms of illegal immigration, in terms of political discord, in terms of economic dislocation. Maybe those of you who stood with me were part of only 15 percent approval of the policy at the time, but when the President of Mexico gets here in the next week or in the next couple of weeks for his State visit, we will see a Mexico coming back in the right direction, moving toward constructive partnership with the United States, with a future that we can be hopeful about, instead of one we can rue, because of you and your leadership. And I thank you for that.

I also thank you for your support for our policies designed to improve the security and prosperity and advance the values of the American people around the world. It is no longer possible in this global society to talk about domestic and foreign policy; they're all blurred. And I thank you for your support in policies that have led us to the point where I can say that for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age there are now no foreign missiles pointed at the people of the United States of America.

I thank you for our efforts to make peace in Haiti and Northern Ireland and for the celebration we will have tomorrow on the next step on the road to peace in the Middle East. I thank you for the work we have done to bring a genuine peace in Bosnia. And one of your number, of course, I must thank specifically, because through his combination of energy and imagination, heart, and diplomacy, he has helped time and time again to make the world a safer place, Congressman Bill Richardson. Thank you.

On Friday, I will have the honor of acknowledging the work of another great American, when I present the family of Willie Velasquez with the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor in the land. I wish he could be here tonight to see how much he has helped citizenship to bloom among Hispanic-Americans throughout this country.

I also want to say a special word of thanks to the Hispanic-Americans who have helped

to enrich the work of our administration. Beginning with Henry Cisneros and Federico Peña and the Latinos who have been appointed to the Federal District and Circuit Court of Appeals, those who occupy senior levels in Government in both categories, considerably more than any previous administration. You have proved, as I said in my speech on affirmative action, that excellence and diversity can go hand in hand; they must go hand in hand. And if they do, that is our ticket to a very, very bright future.

I thank those from my administration who are here tonight, including Gil Casellas, Norma Cantu, Maria Echaveste, Nelson Diaz, George Muñoz, Aida Alvarez, Fernando Torres-Gil, Katherine Archuleta, Jack Otero; the people from the White House who have been wonderful to be part of my family, Janet Murguia, Suzanna Valdez, Carolyn Curiel, Ray Martinez, Alfred Ramirez, Liz Montoya and Grace Garcia, my advance person who got me in here tonight. I couldn't get around without her anymore. I thank her. I also want to thank someone who recently left the White House, Isabelle Rodriguez Tapia, who was the Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of Advance for both the First Lady and for me. All of these people and so many others are a part of what America is in its Government. And this is terribly important.

As we look at this balanced budget, I ask you to think about the people, the values, the vision you have for the future. It's really about values. Should we balance the budget? Of course, we should. Of course, we should. We never had a permanent deficit, never, until the 12 years before I come to Washington. We never had one before. And lest anyone blame any one party or the other, I would remind you that in 11 of those 12 years, the Congress appropriated less money, not more, than the President asked for. This was not a partisan thing, but Presidents have a responsibility to lead. And thanks to the efforts of many of you here, we reduced our Government deficit from \$290 billion to \$160 billion, a 40 percent reduction in 3 years, the first time since President Truman that had been done.

So, should we balance the budget? Of course, we should. Otherwise we will spend

more and more of your money on paying interest on the debt, and we'll have less to spend on the things that make us strong and good and give us a better future. Otherwise we will take too much money at interest rates that are too high away from the business community in America that needs to borrow that money to generate jobs in the private sector, which is where we're trying to grow our future.

But the question is, how should we do this, and don't we have to do it in a way that is consistent with our most fundamental values, with work and family, with responsibility, with our obligations to the elderly and to our children, with our obligations to help those who cannot help themselves through no fault of their own, and perhaps to stop helping those who can help themselves just as well without it? What are we going to do? How are we going to do this?

Let me just offer a few observations. I don't think it is consistent with our values to balance the budget by reducing the number of college scholarships and more affordable college loans or by depriving hundreds of thousands of little children who happen to be poor the chance to get off to a good start in school or by depriving schools of the chance to have smaller classes and computers in the classroom and meet the higher standards that we're holding out for them, just because the districts happen to be poor.

Why are we trying to balance the budget to strengthen America's future? We cannot strengthen America's future in a global economy, where what we earn depends on what we can learn, by weakening our commitment to education at the moment we should be strengthening that commitment to education. And let me say this as an aside: neither should we use the balanced budget as an excuse just to go after things that we do not like and cannot find a more open way to deal with.

And I want to just say a word in that context about bilingual education. Of course, English is the language of the United States. Of course, it is. That is not the issue. The issue is whether children who come here, while they are learning English, should also be able to learn other things. The issue is whether American citizens who work hard

and pay taxes and are older and haven't mastered English yet should be able to vote like other citizens. The issue, in short, is not whether English is our language, it is. The issue is whether or not we're going to value the culture, the traditions of everybody and also recognize that we have a solemn obligation every day in every way to let these children live up to the fullest of their God-given capacities. That's what this is about.

Look at the balanced budget on the tax issue. Can we afford to reduce taxes and balance the budget? I believe we can. But we should do it consistent with our values. We should not cut taxes more than we can afford to do and provide our other obligations and meet them. And we should focus tax relief on the most important and most stressed things in our society, the need that middle class families have to get help with raising their children and to get help with financing the cost of education after high school. That's what we ought to do.

And the last thing we ought to do—the last thing we ought to do is what is now proposed, unbelievably, by the congressional majority. They want to raise the family tax credit by \$40 billion. One of the most important things we did in 1993 with our economic proposal was to give over 14 million working families who lived on modest incomes a reduction in their income taxes to send out two very important messages: Number one, this country should never favor welfare over work. And number two, if someone is working 40 hours a week and they have children in their home, they should not live in poverty because of a tax system. We must not reverse that. How in the world—how in the world anyone could justify cutting the taxes of someone in my income group and raising the taxes on working mothers with children who have an income of \$11,500 a year is beyond me. It is wrong, and we must stop it. We must not permit it to be done.

And let me say this: There's a lot of budget balancing to be done in the name of welfare reform. This administration has given 35 States the right to get out from under various Federal rules and regulations, to do more to move people from welfare to work. But what is our objective with welfare reform? It is to see people who are poor who may have

made some mistakes in their lives have the chance to live good, strong, pro-work, pro-family lives. Our objective is to look at the reality of America where most parents work and most parents have to work and to say what we want is for everybody who can work to work, but we also want people to succeed as parents, for that is still our most important job.

And we must do both those things with welfare reform. Therefore, I say to you, it's all right to be very tough in child support enforcement. The Congress has adopted my provisions because there aren't any that are tougher. It is all right to be strong in saying you must, if you can, be in school or be in a training program or take a job when it is offered. And it is good that the Congress seems to be willing now to give some funds for child support so that you don't have to neglect your children if you go to work and you're poor. But it is wrong to use this as an excuse to punish people just because they're poor or they made a mistake or they happen to be children who, through no fault of their own, are in the family they're in.

Democratic, Republican Governors, the Catholic Church, they've all helped us to try to take some of these extreme provisions out of the welfare reform debate. And I say we have to keep them out. And let's remember, what we want is for people to be able to work and raise their children with dignity in this country. That is the purpose of welfare reform.

Finally, let me just give you one last example. There's a lot of talk about Medicare and Medicaid. We have to slow the rate of inflation in those programs. If we don't, they will soon be taking virtually all the discretionary money of the Government. We won't have money to invest in education or Secretary Peña's infrastructure programs that can put people back to work and rebuild communities. So we do have to do that.

It is true that the Medicare Trust Fund needs help. But the trustees that are so often cited by the congressional majority say that it costs \$90 billion to fix the Medicare Trust Fund for more than a decade. That money comes from slowing the reimbursement rates to medical providers. Their proposal to double the premiums, double the deductibles,

stop giving Medicare to anybody under 67 years old, to raise 3 times as much as it takes to bail out the Trust Fund has nothing to do with saving Medicare; it has everything to do with funding their budget priorities.

My priorities say, we owe it to the elderly not to do that to them. Most of them have very limited incomes. The average senior lady in the country—a woman over 65 living alone is living on less than \$9,000 a year average. In many States, 75 percent of those folks are living on less than \$7,500 a year. They cannot afford to have their premiums and deductibles doubled. It is wrong. It is not necessary. And we should not do it.

And finally, let me say just a word about the Medicaid program. It's not popular to stand up for poor children anymore, but the Medicaid program, two-thirds of that money in Medicaid goes to the elderly and the disabled Americans of this country. It pays for their nursing home care, for in-home care to avoid the costs of going to nursing homes, and for hospital care. About a third of the money goes to the poor children of America to pay for their medical bills. And a lot of that money goes to hospitals in big cities and isolated rural areas.

And if you take a third of that money away over the next 7 years, 3 times as much as I have recommended in my balanced budget plan, there is no way you will not do grievous harm to the elderly, the disabled, and the poorest, most vulnerable children in America. And to all those who say, "Well, I'd rather have mine now; I don't care about them," just remember, those children will be—will be—the adults of the future. And we—those in my age group—will be depending on those kids to take care of us when we are retired. We are a family. We better act like a family. We cannot afford to do these things that violate our family values.

Lastly, let me say how very proud I am that the Hispanic Caucus mirrors these values every day in their work. And let me encourage all of you who may be discouraged by what I have just said, and I left a lot of things out. They also have proposed, for example, that if an elderly couple has one of—the husband or the wife needs to go into the nursing home, they've proposed letting States require the one that's not in a nursing

home to have to sell their house, their car, and clean out their bank accounts before the one who's in the nursing home can get any kind of help. I don't think that's right, either.

My idea of the America of the 21st century is a high-opportunity country where everybody has a chance to live up to the fullest of their ability. I do not want my child to get ahead by driving elderly people into poverty. That is not my idea of family values. That is not the right thing to do.

Now, I want to ask all of you, without regard to your political party or where you live or what your income is, in these next few weeks to urge the Congress to live by the values of Hispanic America, to decide by the values of Hispanic America, to lift up work and family, to work for more freedom and responsibility, to remember our obligations to our children and to our parents, and to remember, the future belongs to the United States if we can just remember that we're a community, not a crowd.

Look at America and imagine what the world's going to be like in 20 or 25 years, the global economy, people moving around, technology, ideas, information moving around. There is no country in this world as well-suited to seize the 21st century as the United States, if we will just remember how we got to where we are: by being a community, not a crowd.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:50 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to NBC News correspondent Giselle Fernandez.

**Executive Order 12973—
Amendment to Executive Order No.
12901**

September 27, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including sections 141 and 301–310 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2171, 2411–2420), and to ensure that the trade policies of the United States advance, to the greatest extent possible, the export of the products and services of the United States and that trade policy

resources are used efficiently, it is hereby ordered that Executive Order No. 12901 of March 3, 1994, is amended in section 1 by inserting in the first sentence "1996" in place of "1994" and "1997" in place of "1995."

William J. Clinton

The White House,
September 27, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:26 a.m., September 29, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 28, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 2.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestine Liberation Organization

September 28, 1995

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. Chairman, do you think this will lead to a Palestinian state, this signing today?

Chairman Arafat. The most important thing, it will lead to a permanent and just solution and peace in the Middle East.

Q. But will it lead to a Palestinian state? You want a Palestinian state, you want a capital in Jerusalem. Is this a step in that direction?

Chairman Arafat. And we have expressed our—from the first day, we were talking with the Israelis, even during the Sadat period, when he was making his invitation with Mr. Begin.

Q. Mr. Chairman, are you worried about another outbreak of terrorism in the wake of this agreement, as there have been in the past? Are you worried about another outbreak of terrorism?

Chairman Arafat. Look, there are many enemies against this, the peace process. And for this, we call it "the peace of the braves." And we are in need of all our efforts and this extensive help to overcome all of these obstacles, including the terror and the oppositions on the two sides.

Q. Have you solved all the problems with the Israelis, particularly the date for a military pullout from—

Chairman Arafat. Yes, the last one has been informed to us from Mr. Dennis on the phone. And there is—there was a contact with Abu Alaa when we were in the meeting with His Excellency, Prime Minister Major, which were the most important points which had been changed—

Q. But all the issues have been solved?

Chairman Arafat. Yes.

Q. —including the—[inaudible]—

Chairman Arafat. There is now—there is now a committee to finalize the whole situation.

Q. Mr. President, what is the U.S. policy on a Palestinian state? What is the U.S. policy, currently? What is the U.S. policy?

Q. President Clinton, could you maybe tell us how you defined the U.S. role in today's events and what transpired here?

The President. Well, we've continued to work to try to help the parties make peace and to help them reach their own agreements. And that is what they have done in good faith and with very difficult negotiations. And now that they have taken this other important step, as they take successive steps, we will try to make sure each step succeeds, that we build on it and we keep working until we have a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

And I am very proud of the work that the Secretary of State has done, that Dennis Ross has done, and that the others involved in our team have done. But the credit here, the ultimate credit, belongs to the parties, to the Palestinians and the Israelis, who have been working through this in a very difficult way. We have said that our job was to support the peace process and to help make sure it succeeds once an agreement is reached. This is another important agreement. We'll do our best to make sure it succeeds.

[At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.]

Q. Mr. President, do you think after this signing ceremony that you will be going to the Middle East and visit these peripheries, the Palestinian periphery, the Israeli periphery, the Egyptian periphery, and the Jordanian periphery, as well as Syria and Lebanon?

The President. I don't know the answer to that, but I know we will do everything we can to make sure these signing ceremonies are successful. We have worked very hard, the United States has, with your leaders, with the Israelis, with others, to try to help make peace in the Middle East and to try to help make sure each step along the way is successful. And we will keep working until we finish the job.

[At this point, a question was asked in Arabic, and no translation was provided.]

Chairman Arafat. According to the agreement, they will be released, all—[inaudible]—on three schedules. The first one, directly after the signing of this agreement here, under his extensive supervision and after that, before the election. And the third one, later on.

[A question was asked in Arabic, and no translation was provided.]

Chairman Arafat. The most important thing is we work together for the new history in the Middle East on the platform of comprehensive, lasting peaceful solution in the whole—[inaudible]—not only with the Egyptians, not only with the Palestinians, not only with the Jordanians. And also we hope that it will continue to be with the Syrians and with the Lebanese, too.

NOTE: The exchange began at 8:45 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In the exchange, the following persons were referred to: Dennis Ross, Special Middle East Coordinator; Abu Alaa (Ahmed Qurei), chief Palestinian negotiator; and Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel

September 28, 1995

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, do you think this agreement today will be a step toward a Palestinian state?

Prime Minister Rabin. I'll answer questions later. I came—we came to visit with

the President. After the signing he will be able to ask questions. I prefer not to answer—not to respond to them at this stage.

Q. Maybe the President will be less shy. Mr. President, U.S. policy has been against Palestinian statehood. But you appear to be moving in that direction. Has U.S. policy shifted?

The President. We're not moving anywhere. We're moving with the parties to help make a peace. The parties are making the peace. Every agreement along the way is an agreement between the parties. We are supporting the peace process, and that's all we're doing, and that's all we will continue to do.

Q. [Inaudible]—need their own state, Mr. President?

Prime Minister Rabin. Allow me not to answer you on specifics. I would like to thank the President for the way that he encouraged, assisted, and helped the peace process in the last almost 3 years. I believe that the approach that was taken by the President, the way that he just said so, is to encourage the parties to the conflict to be the parties for peace. The responsibility, the main responsibility of the peacemaking process lies with the parties to the conflict. We appreciate and are thankful to the President for his assistance and encouragement to reach agreements, the kind that we have reached—started 2 years ago almost in signing the DOP, then the Washington Declaration with Jordan, then the peace treaty with Jordan, hopefully today, the second phase of the implementation of the DOP after the Cairo agreement to the whole West Bank. And I believe what has happened in the last over 2 years is a remarkable progress with tranquility, stability, and peace in the region.

Q. Mr. Rabin, progress on the Syrian front hasn't been very swift. Do you have any thoughts about whether this will provide impetus for agreement on another front?

Prime Minister Rabin. Be patient.

[At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.]

Q. Mr. President, is there a chance to see President Asad sitting in this room next to you and the Prime Minister?

The President. Well, we would like to see a peace, a comprehensive peace in the Mid-

dle East, but that's up to the parties involved. We'll keep working, and we'll just keep working at it.

Q. Mr. President, how do you see the chances of implementation, this current Oslo B agreement between Israel and the Palestinians? Do you perceive that this—that there are fair chances that it will be implemented correctly, positively?

The President. Yes, I believe that if the parties make a good-faith effort, I will do what I can to see that it's properly implemented and to get the necessary support from around the world.

You know, a lot of people have been cheering this process on, and those who cheer need to support it. And the United States will do what we can to support it. And I will encourage a bipartisan support within the United States and around the world. I think the parties will do their part. And those of us who support peace should do ours.

Q. Do you mean political or economically?

Q. Mr. President, do you think Israel should release all the Palestinian prisoners when the agreement is signed?

The President. Excuse me?

Q. Do you think Israel should release all the Palestinian prisoners now when the agreement is signed?

The President. I think that the United States will take the position we have always taken. The parties are working these matters out, and the parties will continue to do it, and we will support the peace process.

NOTE: The exchange began at 9:28 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Middle East Leaders

September 28, 1995

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, what message should the world get from seeing this group assembled here together today?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, this is truly an historic meeting. The people here represented have never sat together before.

And we have the Foreign Ministers of virtually the entire Arab League here. There's never been, even when we were here last—September 2 years ago, we didn't have this kind of representation.

And the message to the world is that the peoples of the Middle East are coming together. They're moving toward peace. They're determined to reach an honorable, a just, and a lasting peace.

Q. When do you expect President Asad to join you here, Mr. President? When do you expect President Asad of Syria to be here with you?

President Clinton. We don't want to give expectations. All I can tell you is that the message that should come out of this meeting is the peoples of the Middle East are moving toward peace.

Q. President Mubarak, what do you think of this accord? And do you think it is the biggest step in the right direction?

President Hosni Mubarak. I think it's a very good accord. And I can say that it's a very historic one. It's a very good indication about the peace which all of us hope can be maintained and cover all the Middle East.

Q. Are the toughest decisions yet to come?

President Clinton. There are always tough decisions on the road to peace. But look at what's happened. Look at what His Majesty King Hussein and—look at this agreement today. We're moving in the right direction. That's all anyone could ask. And the United States is very, very pleased about it.

[At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.]

Q. Mr. President, to what limit can the United States guarantee the honest implementation for that agreement?

President Clinton. I don't know that the United States is in a position of guaranteeing it, but we have worked with these parties, and we have confidence that there will be an honest effort made to implement the agreement.

And I think the fact that President Mubarak would come here—he has been a very positive force in these negotiations—His Majesty King Hussein would come here for this should be evidence that all of us have

a high level of confidence that we will be able to work together to help this agreement be implemented.

And that will be my message to the others who are coming here from around the world today. Every nation says that it is a friend of peace in the Middle East. Now we must all help this peace to succeed in every way that we possibly can. And the leaders of your region by coming here today have, I think, given great energy and inspiration to that and will increase the chances that this historic meeting will lead to the proper implementation of the agreement and to rewarding the courage of the Israelis and the Palestinians who have made it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:50 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House prior to discussions with King Hussein I of Jordan, President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt, Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks at the Signing Ceremony for the Israeli-Palestinian West Bank Accord

September 28, 1995

The President. Prime Minister Rabin; Chairman Arafat; Your Majesty King Hussein; President Mubarak; Foreign Minister Peres; Mr. Abu Mazin; Prime Ministers Gonzalez, Filali, Bin Shakir; Foreign Minister Kozyrev, our cosponsor of the Middle East peace negotiations; distinguished foreign ministers and members of the Diplomatic Corps; and honored guests:

I welcome you to the White House for this milestone on the path to reconciliation. Today we make a great stride toward the fulfillment of a vision toward the day when two peoples divided by generations, by conflict, are bound now by peace. Finally, the time is approaching when there will be safety in Israel's house, when the Palestinian people will write their own destiny, when the clash of arms will be banished from God's Holy Land.

Two years ago, on another brilliant September day here at the White House, two

men reached across one of history's widest chasms with a simple handshake. That moment is etched forever in our memory. With the eyes of the world upon you, Mr. Prime Minister, you declared your wish to live side by side with the Palestinian people in dignity, in empathy, as human beings, as free men. And you, Mr. Chairman, vowed to wage what you called the most difficult battle of our lives, the battle for peace.

In the days of labor that have followed, you have both shown profound courage in bringing us to this moment, and you have kept your word.

The enemies of peace have fought the tide of history with terror and violence. We grieve for their victims, and we renew our vow to redeem the sacrifice of those victims. We will defeat those who will resort to terror. And we revere the determination of these leaders who chose peace, who rejected the old habits of hatred and revenge. Because they broke so bravely with the past, the bridges have multiplied, bridges of communication, of commerce, of understanding. Today, the landscape changes and the chasm narrows.

The agreement that now will be signed means that Israel's mothers and fathers need no longer worry that their sons will face the dangers of patrolling Nablus or confronting the hostile streets of Ramallah. And it means that Palestinians will be able to decide for themselves what their schools teach, how their houses should be built, and who they choose to govern.

You, the children of Abraham, have made a peace worthy of your great forebear. Abraham, patriarch of both Arabs and Jews, sacrificed power for peace when he said to his nephew, Lot, "Let there be no strife between thee and me. If thou will take the left hand, then I will go to the right." Patience and persistence, courage and sacrifice: These are the virtues, then as now, that set peacemakers apart.

Mr. Prime Minister and Mr. Chairman, you are showing that it is not by weapons, but by will and by word, that dreams best become reality. Your achievement shines as an inspiration to others all around this world who seek to overcome their own conflicts and to secure for themselves the blessings of peace.

Chapter by chapter, Jews and Arabs are writing a new history for their ancient lands. Camp David; the Declaration of Principles, signed here 2 years ago; the peace of the Arava last year between Jordan and Israel: With each of these, the truth of this book has become clear to the world. As courageous leaders stepped beyond the bounds of convention, they build for their peoples a new world of hope and peace.

Now, as this new chapter begins, it is fitting that we are joined by so many from the camp of peace. Egypt's President Mubarak has carried forth the commitment to peace that began with Anwar el-Sadat and the miracle at Camp David. Before there was a glimpse of a breakthrough, President Mubarak stood for reconciliation. And he added his strength, his personal strength, time and time again in the days of the negotiations.

Almost a year ago, on the border that had known only barbed wire and armed patrols, King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin brought their nations together in peace. Already that border has been transformed, as have the lives of Israelis and Jordanians, after 46 years as enemies. King Hussein stands a rock on which peace can be built. In only a few weeks, he will host the economic summit in Amman that will bring together Israelis and Arabs from throughout the region, business and government leaders from throughout the world, to map the promise of tomorrow.

Today we are also joined by the largest group of Arab foreign ministers ever assembled to support the growth of peace. Prime Minister Filali of Morocco has traveled here to represent King Hassan, who has done so much to advance progress in the region. With us as well are representatives of nations that have provided vital support for peace, including the countries of the European Union, Japan, Canada, and of course, Norway, whose assistance 2 years ago opened the way to this moment.

All those who doubt the spirit of peace should remember this day and this extraordinary array of leaders who have joined together to bring a new era of hope to the Middle East. The United States is proud to stand with all of them.

Much remains to be done. But we will continue to walk each step of the way with those who work and risk for peace. We will press forward with our efforts until the circle of peace is closed, a circle which must include Syria and Lebanon if peace is to be complete. We will not rest until Muslims and Jews can turn their backs to pray without any fear; until all the region's children can grow up untouched by conflict, until the shadow of violence is lifted from the land of light and gold.

Thank you very much.

[At this point, the Israeli-Palestinian West Bank Accord was signed. Following the signing, King Hussein of Jordan, President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt, Chairman Yasser Arafat of the PLO, and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel made remarks.]

The President. As we adjourn, let me once again thank all of our guests from across the world who have come here to be a part of this and to wish all the parties well. Let me thank those who spoke today for their contributions to the peace process.

Let me say a special word of thanks to the members of Congress who have come here from both parties, including both Jewish-Americans and Arab-Americans represented in our United States Congress, for their support of the United States effort.

And let me close with this simple thought. As the cold war has given way to a global village in which the enemies of peace are many and dispersed all across the world, the United States is honored and obligated to be a force for peace, from Northern Ireland to Southern Africa, from Bosnia to Haiti, to reducing the nuclear threat and the threat of biological and chemical weapons to fighting against terrorism and organized crime.

But this is special. For it is in this place that those of us who believe that the world was created by, is looked over by, and ultimately will be accountable to one great God. All of us came from there, whether we find that wisdom in the Torah or the Koran or the Christian Holy Bible. If we could all learn in that place to find the secret of peace, then perhaps the dream of peace on Earth can truly be realized.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:23 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Foreign Minister Shimon Peres of Israel; Mahmud Abbas (Abu Mazin), head of the PLO committee on negotiations; Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez of the European Union; Prime Minister Abdellatif Filali of Morocco; Prime Minister Zayd Bin Shakir of Jordan; and Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev of Russia.

Remarks at a Reception for Heads of State

September 28, 1995

Thank you very much. On behalf of the First Lady and myself, the Vice President and Mrs. Gore, and Secretary Christopher, we are delighted to welcome all of our visitors from around the world, and especially from the Middle East, the Prime Ministers, the Foreign Ministers, especially Mrs. Rabin and Mrs. Arafat, Mrs. Mubarak, and Her Majesty Queen Noor.

We are delighted to be here again with these four great leaders who have just spoken. I was looking at His Majesty King Hussein when he said he was almost 60, thinking that he has been on the throne for more than 40 years. What I thought to myself was, for myself, I don't object to term limits, but I'm awfully glad he was not subject to them—[laughter]—because the Middle East is a different place because of the way King Hussein has lived his life for peace all these decades.

I thank President Mubarak for the power of his example, the constant strength of his determination. Not so very long ago, my family and I were, as with many Americans, praying for his safety. We are glad to see him strong, leading the world working toward peace.

I agree with Prime Minister Rabin that Chairman Arafat makes a good speech and a passionate one. What an interesting turn of events his life has taken, and how fortunate we all are that he decided to take his risks for peace.

Mr. Prime Minister, you give a pretty good speech yourself. I think you give such a good speech because it is obvious to everyone that every word you utter comes from your heart and your mind together, and we thank you.

And to all my fellow Americans and all of you here present, we've heard a lot of wonderful words today. I would like to close with three brief points that I believe should be emphasized. First, I want to recognize the negotiators, Foreign Minister Peres, Mr. Abu Mazin, Mr. Uri Savir, and Mr. Abu Alaa and their teams. They did this, and we should applaud them. We should applaud them. [Applause]

I watched today in the Cabinet Room while the Prime Minister and Chairman Arafat literally signed, initialed, the annex to this agreement, which included 26 different maps, comprising literally thousands and thousands of decisions that these two sides made. After long and arduous argument, they found common ground. It was an astonishing achievement, the care, the detail, the concern that they manifested and the effort it took to reach agreement was truly extraordinary. And I do not want that to escape anyone's attention.

The second thing I want to say is that this agreement embodies, for those of us who are Americans, the things that we believe in the most, for this agreement required the acceptance of responsibility, along with the assertion of freedom and independence. This agreement required people to think about the interests of their children and the sacrifices of their parents. This agreement required a real effort to reach principled compromise, common ground, and higher ground. And make no mistake about it, this agreement required these decisionmakers to do things that may be unpopular in the short run, because they know that 10, 20, 30 years from now, it is the only course for the future of the people that they love.

And that brings me to the second point: What are our obligations, the rest of us? We can clap for them. But they have to go back to work tomorrow. When the glamour is gone and the applause has died out, they will be back at the hard work. There are two things we can do for them. The first thing we have to do is to stand with them against terrorism. It is the enemy of peace everywhere.

Now we in America know what it is like to see parents grieving over the bodies of their children and children grieving over the bodies of their parents because people be-

lieve that terrorism is simply politics by other means. We have had our hearts ripped out, and now we know better. So we must stand with them against terrorism.

The second thing we have to do is to work with them to achieve the benefits of peace, for the peace has to bring people the opportunity to work with dignity, to educate their children, to clean up their environment, to invest in their future. Hundreds and hundreds of Arab-Americans and Jewish-Americans have the capacity to work with these people in partnership to transform the future of the Middle East. And I say again, let us do our part.

Finally, let me say to all the Members of Congress here present and those who were there this afternoon, I thank you for your presence and your support of this process.

We know that in this era where we have gone from the bipolar world of the cold war to a global village with all kinds of new and different threats to our security, only the United States can stand consistently throughout the world for the cause of freedom and democracy and opportunity. We know that, and we must continue to do that, not simply for the people of the Middle East but for ourselves as well. For when we work for peace in Northern Ireland, in Southern Africa, in Haiti, in Bosnia, when we work to dismantle the threat of nuclear war and fight terrorism, we help ourselves and our children's future.

But I will say again what I said today: If we can make peace in the Middle East, if we can help the people who live there to make their own peace, it will have a special meaning for ourselves and for the world in the 21st century for the simple reason that the world's three great religions who believe that one God created us, watches over us, and ultimately will hold us to account for what we do—we all study through the Koran, through the Torah, through the Holy Bible those lessons—surely if those people can resolve all their differences, we can bring peace to all the world.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 8:15 p.m. at the Corcoran Gallery. In his remarks, he referred to President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt and his wife, Suzanne; Prime Minister Yitzhak

Rabin of Israel and his wife, Lea; PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat and his wife, Suha; Queen Noor, wife of King Hussein; Foreign Minister Shimon Peres of Israel; and Director General Uri Savir, Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Remarks on Presenting the Presidential Medal of Freedom

September 29, 1995

Good morning, and welcome to all of you, especially to the honorees, their family members, their friends, the distinguished Members of Congress.

The Presidential Medal of Freedom is the highest honor given to civilians in the United States. It has a special history, established 50 years ago by President Truman, to honor noble service in time of war. In 1963, President Kennedy expanded its purpose, making it an honor for distinguished civilian service in peacetime. The 12 Americans we honor today embody the best qualities in our national character. All have committed themselves, both publicly and privately, to expanding the circle of freedom and the opportunities the responsible exercise of freedom brings, at home and around the world.

In this time of change, where people's living patterns and working patterns are undergoing such dramatic transformation, it is necessary and fashionable to focus on new ideas and new visions of the future. We are here today to celebrate people who have always been for change and who have changed America for the better but who have done it based on the enduring values that make this country great: the belief that we have to give all of our citizens the chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given capacities; the conviction that we have to do everything we can to strengthen our families and our communities; the certainty that when the chips are down, we have to do what is good and right, even if it is unpopular in the short run; the understanding that we have the obligation to honor those who came before us by passing better lives and brighter opportunities on to those who come after.

This medal commemorates the remarkable service and indelible spirit of individual Americans. But it also serves as a beacon to all Americans and especially to our children.

For our children, especially now when so many of their lives have been darkened by violence and irresponsible or absent role models, the robbers of innocence, is poverty and drug abuse and gang life, the excesses of our modern commercial media culture and other forces that are undermining the fabric of good lives, all of these things require more and more people to live by the values and measure up to the example of the winners of the Presidential Medal of Freedom. They represent in so many ways the true face of American heroism today.

Let me begin now by introducing each of them in turn.

As a young mother 27 years ago, Peggy Charren took a good look at her children's frequent companion, television. And she did not like what she saw. But unlike others who simply bemoan the problem, she actually did something about it. She took a stand against entrenched and powerful institutions in Government and in business, and she made them listen. She started Action for Children's Television. As a result, she uplifted the quality of what comes into our homes and inspired a whole generation of citizen activists. In 1990, the campaign that began in front of Peggy Charren's television set reached Capitol Hill when Congress passed the Children's Television Act. And for the first time, the television industry was challenged to fulfill its responsibility to educate our children, not just to entertain them. Peggy Charren, mother and now grandmother, leader and reformer in the best American tradition, has put all of our children first, and we thank her for it.

Now, I'm going to change the order here a minute, just a little, and go to Joan Ganz Cooney. While Peggy Charren forced television to change its ways from the outside, Joan Ganz Cooney did the same thing from the inside. In 1968, she launched the Children's Television Workshop, and a whole new landscape of joyful education opened up before our children's eyes. Out of this effort came "Sesame Street," "The Electric Company," "3-2-1 Contact," and other programs that enlighten not only our youngsters but older people as well. With a host of lovable characters like the Cookie Monster and Big Bird, who became as familiar to me at one

point in our family life as the people I grew up with—[*laughter*—these shows have helped teach a generation of children to count and to read and to think. They also teach us more about how we should live together. We all know that Grover and Kermit reinforce rather than undermine the values we work so hard to teach our children, showing kids every day what it means to share, to respect differences, and to recognize that it's not easy being green. [*Laughter*]

Joan Ganz Cooney has proven in living color that the powerful medium of television can be a tool to build reason, not reaction, for growth, not stifling, to help build young lives up rather than tear them down. We all know that TV is here to stay. Most of us, frankly, love it even when we curse it. But we also know that there are clear damaging effects to excessive exposure to destructive patterns of television. As the Vice President and Mrs. Gore have pointed out on so many occasions and as their recent family conference on media and the family demonstrated, the numbing effects of violence or the numbing inability to concentrate that comes from overexposure to mindless, repetitive programming are things that we have to fight against.

Peggy Charren sounded the alarm; Joan Ganz Cooney developed an alternative. And even today as we grapple with this challenge—how to get the best and repress the worst—we know that we would be nowhere near where we are were it not for these two remarkable American heroes. We thank them. Thank you so much.

William T. Coleman, Jr.'s first public act to advance equal opportunity came early in his life. He tried out for his high school swim team, and in response, the school disbanded the team. [*Laughter*] For four decades in the courtroom, the boardroom, the halls of power, Bill Coleman has put his brilliant legal intellect in service to our country. He was the first African-American accepted on the Harvard Law Review, the first to serve as a clerk on the United States Supreme Court, the first to serve in the President's Cabinet—the second to serve in the President's Cabinet, and the first to reach the pinnacle of the corporate bar. As Secretary of Transportation to President Ford, he helped

to open the doors of opportunity to thousands of black entrepreneurs. As a corporate director, he broke the color barrier in the Nation's executive suites. Today, as chairman of the board of the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, he continues the fight.

I have known Bill Coleman for a long time. I had the honor and pleasure of being his son's roommate for a year in law school. I think it is fair to say that the first time we saw each other, he never dreamed that I would be here and he would be there. [Laughter]

But I can honestly say, if you are looking for an example of constancy, consistency, disciplined devotion to the things that make this country a great place, you have no further to look than William Coleman, Jr. Thank you.

Fifty years ago, John Hope Franklin was on a train in North Carolina, jammed into a compartment reserved for baggage and for African-Americans. When he asked the conductor if he and his fellow passengers could move to a near-empty car occupied by just five white men, he was told it couldn't be done, for the men, the conductor said, were German prisoners of war. John Hope Franklin and those with him were prisoners of something else, American racism.

John Hope Franklin has both lived and chronicled the history of race in America. He is the author of many books, including the classic "From Slavery to Freedom: A History of African-Americans." He provided Thurgood Marshall with critical historical research for the landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education*. He has taught throughout America and around the world, and he has influenced countless, countless students of the American scene with his profound scholarship.

"I look history straight in the eye and call it like it is," John Hope Franklin has said. This has meant telling the untold stories of northern racism and of slaves successfully striking for better conditions under the sinful confines of slavery. It has meant blazing a trail through the academy, but never confusing his role as an advocate with his role as a scholar. It has meant holding to the conviction that integration is a national necessity if we are to truly live by the values enshrined in the Constitution.

John Hope Franklin, the Son of the South, has always been a moral compass for America, always pointing us in the direction of truth. I think I can speak for Hillary and for the Vice President and Mrs. Gore in saying that one of the most memorable moments of our campaign in 1992 was having John Hope Franklin take a ride with us on our campaign bus. And he sat in the front. [Laughter]

In 1944, at the age of 16, Leon Higginbotham arrived at his midwestern college only to be pushed back by the icy hand of racism. There, he and 12 other African-American students were housed in an unheated attic. Fed up with sub-zero nights, Leon Higginbotham went to the university president to protest. "Higginbotham," the president said, "the law doesn't require us to let colored students in the dorm, and you either accept things as they are or leave the university." So Leon Higginbotham set out to change the law. He went to Yale Law School, and after he was rejected by every major Philadelphia law firm because of his race, he turned to public service, working as a community lawyer and a State and Federal official.

When Leon Higginbotham was named to the Federal bench at the age of 36 by President Kennedy, he was the youngest Federal judge to be appointed in three decades. He served with distinction and eventually became judge of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. He also found the time to write and speak with idealism and rigor on the great dilemmas of race and justice.

His retirement has been spent, remarkably, helping to draft the constitution for a democratic South Africa and teaching a fresh generation of students at Harvard. We honor Judge Higginbotham whose life as much as his scholarship has set an example of commitment, enlargement, and service to new minds at home, and now, thank God, to a newly free South Africa an ocean away.

Thank you, Leon Higginbotham.

Judge Frank Johnson could not be here today and so had to send the young gentleman to my left to receive his award for him. He was advised by his doctor not to travel. I admire that doctor. I imagine that he is the first person who ever got Frank

Johnson to do something he did not want to do. *[Laughter]*

For his steadfastness, his constitutional vision, his courage to uphold the value of equal opportunity, even at the expense of his own personal safety, for these things, we honor Frank Johnson with the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

During 40 years on the bench, Judge Johnson made it his mission to see to it that justice was done within the framework of law. In the face of unremitting social and political pressure to uphold the traditions of oppression and neglect in his native South, never once did he yield. His landmark decisions in the areas of desegregation, voting rights, and civil liberties transformed our understanding of the Constitution. He fought for the right of Rosa Parks to sit where she wanted on the bus and battled for the right of Martin Luther King and others to march from Selma to Montgomery.

Armed with a gavel and the Constitution, Frank Johnson changed the face of the South. He challenged America to move closer to the ideals upon which it is founded and forever will be an inspiration to all who admire courage and value freedom. We wish you were here with us today, but his spirit is in this place, and we thank him.

For a good long while now, Dr. C. Everett Koop, as Surgeon General of the United States and afterward as America's most well-known private doctor, has told the Nation the truth as he sees it, whether we want to hear it or not. In so doing, he has saved countless lives and left an enduring legacy of the doctor as a healer in the broadest and deepest sense of the word.

Dr. Koop's life has been defined by doing the right thing. He chose children's medicine for the simple reason that his colleagues were ignoring it. He refused to let political considerations leave Americans vulnerable to the epidemics of AIDS and teen pregnancy. He fought for sex education knowing that if he were to be true to the value of protecting our children, we could not let them live in perilous ignorance. He told America that tobacco is addictive, that it kills, and that we have to get cigarettes out of our children's hands.

He helped us to come to grips with the painful shortcomings in America's health care delivery system and what it means for children that over 40 million of our people have no health insurance. And we value his support for the action now being taken to try to protect children's lives from the epidemic of smoking, which embraces 3,000 of them a day and will shorten 1,000 of their lives every day.

Dr. Koop's record is a priceless reminder that disease is immune to ideology and that viruses do not play politics. Over the course of his career, I have seen him attacked from both the left and the right for his strong convictions. But all of us who have watched him, not only in public but as Hillary and I have had the chance to do in private, know that in the very best sense, he stands for life in America and for the potential of all of our children. And for that, the United States should be eternally grateful to C. Everett Koop.

Twenty-five years ago this year, Americans came together for the very first Earth Day. They came together to make it clear that dirty air, poison water, spoiled land were simply unacceptable. They came together to say that preserving our natural heritage for our children is a national value. And they came together, more than anything else, because of one American, Gaylord Nelson. His career as Wisconsin's Governor, United States Senator, and now as counselor of the Wilderness Society has been marked by integrity, civility, and vision. His legacy is inscribed in legislation, including the National Environmental Education Act and the 1964 Wilderness Act.

As the father of Earth Day, he is the grandfather of all that grew out of that event: the Environmental Protection Act, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act. He also set a standard for people in public service to care about the environment and to try to do something about it. And I think that the Vice President would want me to say that young people like Al Gore, back in 1970, realized, because of Gaylord Nelson, that if they got into public service, they could do something to preserve our environment for future generations.

In the 1970's, when a river was so polluted it actually caught on fire, Gaylord Nelson

spoke up. He insisted that Americans deserved the safety that comes from knowing the world we live in will not make us sick. He warned that our leaders should never let partisan politics divert us from responsibility to our shared environment. He inspired us to remember that the stewardship of our natural resources is the stewardship of the American dream. He is the worthy heir of the tradition of Theodore Roosevelt, and the Vice President's work and that of all other environmentalists today is the worthy heir of Gaylord Nelson.

Today as much as at any time in modern American history, we need to remember what we share on this precious planet and in this beloved country. And I hope that Gaylord's Nelson shining example will illuminate all the debates in this city for years to come.

Walter Reuther was an American visionary so far ahead of his times that although he died a quarter of a century ago, our nation has yet to catch up to his dreams. A tool and die maker by trade, Walter Reuther built a great union that lifted industrial workers into the middle class. But he always understood that the UAW stood for something greater and nobler than a few more dollars in the paycheck. So he fought for causes on the edge of America's horizon, from racial justice to small cars that would conserve fuel and compete successfully both here and abroad.

He wanted America to create an economy strong and supple enough to convert from peacetime production to defense work and back again without costing workers and their families their livelihoods. As the journalist Murray Kempton said later, "Walter Reuther was one man who could reminisce about the future." The union he led and the future he built stand as a memorial to what is bravest and best in the American spirit. Would that we had more people like him today. We are honored that his daughters are here and that his award will be received by his young grandson, Walter Reuther.

Our homes, our cities, our neighborhoods, our communities, all these represent who we are. With the helping hand of James Rouse, many of these places have come to reflect our best values. In the 1960's, James Rouse saw a problem. Poorly planned suburban neighborhoods did more than take away from

the landscape, they had a corrosive effect on our sense of community. So he did something about it; he conceived and built Columbia, Maryland. By updating the colonial village for modern times, he gave a generation of architects and designers a blueprint for reviving community all across our Nation.

A decade later, James Rouse turned to another monumental task, healing the torn-out heart of America's cities. He met the challenge head-on. With Boston's Faneuil Hall, Baltimore Harbor Place, and other developments, he put the town square, squarely back into America's urban life. He proved that we could reclaim and recreate our urban frontiers. Adviser to Presidents, foe of economic and racial segregation, champion of high-quality, affordable housing, James Rouse's life has been defined by faith in the American spirit. He has made our cities and our neighborhoods as beautiful as the lives that pass through them.

He has shown us that we can build communities worthy of the character and optimism of our people. I know that he has had a special impact on our Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Henry Cisneros. And I can tell you that he has had a very special impact on my life. Every time I see James Rouse I think, if every American developer had done what James Rouse has done with his life, we would have lower crime rates, fewer gangs, less drugs; our children would have a better future; our cities would be delightful places to live; we would not walk in fear, we would walk in pride down the streets of our cities, just as we still can in the small towns in America. James Rouse has changed this country. And if more will follow his lead, we can do the entire job we need to do in our cities. Mr. James Rouse.

His name was William C. Velasquez, but everyone knew his as Willie. Willie was and is now a name synonymous with democracy in America. Through the organization he founded, the Southwest Voter Registration Education Project, he nearly doubled Hispanic voter registration, and dramatically increased the number of Latino elected officials in this Nation. His appeal to the Hispanic community was simple, passionate, and direct: "*Su voto es su voz*," your vote is your voice.

The movement he began here at home went on to support democracy abroad in El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Mexico, and in South Africa. From the farm fields of California, where he organized workers with Cesar Chavez, to the halls of Harvard, where he taught politics, Willie Velasquez was driven by an unwavering belief that every American should have a role in our democracy and a share in the opportunities of our great Nation.

Willie Velasquez died too young. He was just 44 when he passed away in 1988. But in his vibrant life, he restored faith in our ideals and in ourselves. And no person in modern America who has run for public office wherever Hispanic Americans live has failed to feel the hand of Willie Velasquez. He made this a greater country and we're honored that his wife is here with us today.

It is not surprising that Lew Wasserman has devoted his life to helping others to see. For it was his vision that led him from the streets of Cleveland to the top of Hollywood and his perspective that inspired him to give so much back to a nation that had given so much to him. Lew Wasserman helped to build MCA from a small booking agency into a vast multimedia company. His feat awakened the world to the infinite promise of the American entertainment industry.

It also showed a new generation of American business leaders that a company's success can be measured by the depth of its values as well as by the size of its revenues. In honor of MCA's founder, the eye doctor Jules Stein, Lew Wasserman has made an astonishing contribution to treat and to cure blindness. He has devoted himself to strengthening the American community through his role as citizen adviser to almost a half century of Presidents, of both parties, and with his support for countless humanitarian efforts.

Never for a moment has he forgotten his roots, the value of hard work, or the importance of giving people in far, far less fortunate conditions a chance to make something of their lives. The story of Lew Wasserman is the story of the American dream, not—not—just for what he has achieved but far more important for what he has given back. I have met a lot of philanthropists and suc-

cessful people in my life. I don't know that I ever met anybody that more consistently every day looked for another opportunity to do something for somebody else, to give somebody else the chance to enjoy the success that he had in life.

I thank you, Lew Wasserman.

Let me close, before we hear from the official citation and present the medals, by saying that I think that all the people who are here, were they to speak, would tell you that they did not come here alone. They were guided by parents and teachers, by neighbors and mentors. Many were inspired by other great Americans who themselves at some time in the past received this very medal.

The miracle of American life is that this cycle can be repeated over and over again with each succeeding generation; and that with each succeeding generation, we make freedom a little more real and full to all Americans. I ask all of you to think about that. You couldn't help feeling, when you heard these stories, that this is a very great country. And we do not have to give in to our lesser selves. We do not have to be divided. We do not have to achieve less than we can. If we will follow their examples, we will make sure that in the next century, this country will be all it was meant to be for all of our children.

I'd like to now ask the Military Aide to read the citations as I present the Medals of Freedom.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt

September 29, 1995

President Clinton. I thought it was great. I thought your talk was great, what you said. There were some unusual things said yesterday, even more so in some ways than the last time when they were here. What you said and—we've got a transcript we haven't made up our mind about—[laughter].

Good morning, everyone.

Vice President Gore. Your picture is all over the United States today in the morning newspapers.

President Clinton. Yes. I thought it was interesting. The picture that most of them showed was the one in the New York Times today. Most—[inaudible]—showed us, the five of us, you know—have you seen it? [Inaudible]—every time. That's the picture that was mostly in the country.

President Mubarak. Yes.

President Clinton. That was great.
Good morning.

Jerusalem

Q. Mr. President, what do you think is going to happen to Jerusalem when there is a final settlement?

President Clinton. Are you addressing me or President Mubarak? [Laughter]

Q. First Mubarak, then you.

President Clinton. That's good. [Laughter]

Q. Or vice-versa. I think you heard Chairman Arafat say something about a joint cornerstone.

President Mubarak. I think, as Chairman Arafat mentioned yesterday, there should be access of the holy places for all the religions in Eastern Jerusalem. And we know beforehand that Jerusalem will be very difficult to be divided. So any kind of arrangement for Jerusalem, east and west, without dividing it I think may have a problem.

Q. Well, that would be the Israeli position, wouldn't it?

President Mubarak. Look, it's—we should listen to all of the statements coming here and there, but this will be decided during the negotiations. All of us are going to act in that direction, with the help of President Clinton and the administration.

Q. Mr. President, do you want to elaborate on that?

President Clinton. You know what our position is, that the less we say about this at this moment, the better, because the parties have agreed themselves to make this a part of the final status talks. And what we want to do is to create the maximum chance that they will actually reach a good-faith agreement, because if they actually reach a good-faith agreement, then the chances are

much greater that it will then be accepted by all the people in the area.

I think everyone expects that because of the importance of Jerusalem to Muslims, to Jews, and to Christians, that all of us believers from all over the world will be able to show up there and have access to our holy sites. But I think that it's very important that we not prejudge exactly what the structure be. We should let the negotiators work. They have done a marvelous job. I mean, look at yesterday, Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat initialed 26 maps in here. There were thousands and thousands and thousands of excruciatingly detailed decisions made by those negotiators. That is good evidence that they can actually work through these things. And I believe in the end, they will reach whatever they believe is a fair and livable accommodation on Jerusalem, and I want to see them have a chance to do it.

President's Foreign Policy

Q. Do you think, Mr. President, that your foreign policy, foreign policy in general is beginning to fall into place as you see some of the problems that you've had over the past 2½ years get resolved?

President Clinton. Well, I thought we had a pretty good year last year as well. I think what's happening is that these two events of this week show that the announcement in the Middle East in 1993 was not a fluke, not an aberration, that there really is a process unfolding in the Middle East, and that we have a chance to go all the way. And of course, President Mubarak and I will be talking about that today. Until we finish these agreements between the Palestinians and the Israelis and until we have an agreement between Syria and Lebanon and Israel, we won't be able to go all the way, but I think there is a sense of that.

And in Bosnia, I think there is at least a sense that what has been our thorniest and most difficult problem we may be able to work through. Now, we're a long way from getting there, but we are making progress. And I'm hopeful and—these things will make the American people more secure and more prosperous. And they'll live in a world that they feel better about. And I'm happy for

our people, but I'm particularly pleased for the people in the affected areas.

Bosnia

Q. Are you bringing to the leaders today a specific price tag for Bosnia when a peace settlement is reached? What is it you will be asking them?

President Clinton. No, because we have no way of knowing that. We have to see whether there is a peace agreement reached and what the map looks like and what the conditions are, and what we're asked to do as a world community. So we have no way of knowing that right now.

Q. But you're still committed to sending U.S. troops to implement the peace?

President Clinton. I believe the United States should be a part of implementing the peace process. I have said that for almost 3 years. I don't see how, as the leader of NATO and basically the leader of the West we can walk away from that. And I think the American people, once I explain it to them, will go—will be supportive. And I believe the Congress will.

Q. How many?

President Clinton. I'll have more to say about that in the congressional meeting. You can ask more Bosnia questions in there because we're going to talk about that.

Continuing Resolution

Q. Are you going to sign a CR today?

President Clinton. I'll talk about that at the congressional meeting as well.

Q. Got to have something later.

President Clinton. Never satisfied. [Laughter]

Thank you all.

Q. Nothing ventured. [Laughter]

[At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.]

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President Mubarak, can we ask what main issues will be discussed with President Clinton?

President Mubarak. We have various issues to be discussed—implementation of the peace process; we'll speak on Bosnia; we'll speak of cooperation in the area; about the

economic summit in Jordan. We have so many issues to discuss.

Q. President Clinton, actually, I have two questions. I wanted to ask you about what you plan to do in the next stage on bilateral ties with Egypt in order to boost investment, American investment in Egypt. And also, the other question is, we've been talking to many Palestinians about good intentions on the part of the Israelis in order to implement the peace process, and good intentions are the key for the implementation of the peace process—

President Clinton. Well, let me answer—I'll try to answer both of them. First of all, our bilateral relations are important with Egypt, but one of the things that is shaping our bilateral relations is the leadership that Egypt is showing in the region and throughout the Arab world as a force for peace and the strong stand taken against terrorism, which we want to cooperate with and support. I believe that that is very important not only for the strong tourism industry in Egypt but for getting investment and growth into the country and over the long run.

Secondly, I think Egypt's role as a regional leader will help us to strengthen our bilateral relationship. For example, if we can locate the Middle Eastern development bank there, that's not just to develop things for the Palestinians, that's for the whole region. What we want to do is to bring in a huge influx of capital into the Middle East to bring the benefits of peace to all the people who have fought for it. And since Egypt was the first nation to make peace and since President Mubarak has been a leading, consistent, unwavering force for the peace process, I think Egypt would benefit dramatically from that. So we will work on that.

Now secondly, with regard to the intentions of the Israelis, I believe that the Prime Minister and his government are completely committed to this. And I saw yesterday these maps that were signed in here that are the annexes to the words of the agreement. They signed—Chairman Arafat and Prime Minister Rabin signed 26 maps that had literally thousands and thousands of decisions on them. So they know exactly what they're getting into. They have made very, very detailed commitments to one another.

And just as I believe that Chairman Arafat is going to do his best to try to diminish terror, I believe that the Prime Minister will do everything he can to fulfill both the letter and the spirit of the agreement. And that is one of the things that the United States has been able to do with the leadership of the Secretary of State and Mr. Ross. And our whole team is to try to work with the parties to make sure that their relationship ripens.

And I will say this: I would urge you to go back and carefully review the text of the statements made not only yesterday at the ceremony but last night at the reception by both Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat. They said some remarkable things, some things that they certainly didn't say here 2 years ago, which, to me, showed that they are kind of opening up to one another and that the level of trust is growing.

Now, we all know that none of us have total control over people who are, in theory, within our dominion. Here in the United States we have crimes committed every day that the President cannot stop. But I think they are proceeding in good faith, and I think that the people in the Middle East will have a high level of confidence in the way the Israelis proceed now.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:20 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With King Hussein of Jordan

September 29, 1995

1996 Election

Q. Mr. President, I don't know if you've heard that Governor Pete Wilson is going to drop out of the Presidential race this afternoon.

The President. No. Are you sure? [*Laughter*] Well, I—that's a very personal decision. It's a difficult road, and I respect the judgment that he would make, or anybody would make under these circumstances, since I've been through it. I hope we will continue to be able to work together on some of our common problems. I said in Los Angeles when

I was there a couple of days ago that the Governor's office worked very closely with us when we were trying to solve the problems of the medical center for Los Angeles County, and there's a lot of important work to do and he still has a very important job.

Q. Does this help your prospects in California?

The President. I don't know.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:45 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to Governor Pete Wilson of California. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Congressional Leaders

September 29, 1995

Bosnia

The President. Is everyone in? Ladies and gentlemen, we are about to begin a meeting between the congressional leadership and the administration to discuss our progress in Bosnia and where we're going from here. But before we do, let me begin by saying a thank you to the leadership of Congress for their successful effort to avoid any kind of interruption in our Government operations as we work toward a balanced budget over the next several weeks.

This is the kind of cooperation that makes it possible for our country not only to work but to be great. And I hope that we will have more of it. It is also the kind of cooperation, frankly, that was really being celebrated yesterday when we marked another important milestone on the road to peace in the Middle East.

American leadership has worked for peace in the Middle East through Democratic and Republican administrations for a very long time now, step by step, with discipline and determination over years. And yesterday, we celebrated the product of that kind of effort.

Let me also say that I believe we must continue to work together in Bosnia, and I very much appreciate the expressions of support that have come from leaders in both parties for the efforts that we have been making in recent weeks.

We are now closer to a settlement because of the initiatives we've taken than at any time in the last 4 years because of the combined impacts of the NATO air strikes, the United States diplomatic initiative, and the changes that have occurred on the ground. If and when there is a peace agreement, as I have said since early 1993, I believe America must be a part of helping to implement that agreement, because NATO will have to do it in order for it to work, and we are the leaders of NATO.

I have consistently opposed the involvement of our troops in any combat and in this United Nations mission, but this is a very different thing, and I believe it's very, very important that we play a part of it.

I just received an update from our team and the work they're doing, and I can tell you that we are now seeing some serious discussion of the possibility of a cease-fire, which I hope can be successfully concluded as a prelude to getting into the other details of the agreement.

But I'm looking forward to this meeting. I thank Senator Dole, the Speaker, for being here, and Senator Daschle, Congressman Bonior, and all of the others who are here. And we're looking forward to the meeting.

And I thank you for the continuing resolution. If, as expected, it passes today, I expect to sign it as soon as it hits my desk. And as I said, that's a good omen for our efforts to successfully conclude an effort to balance the budget.

1996 Election

Q. Can I ask Senator Dole to comment on Pete Wilson's decision to drop out of the—[laughter]—Presidential race? Is this going to help your prospects of challenging the President next November?

Q. That's a fast jump from Bosnia.

Senator Bob Dole. No, I haven't had a chance to talk to the President about it, so—[laughter].

Q. Does this mean there's no room in the Republican Party for moderate Republicans?

Senator Strom Thurmond. This is not a political meeting.

Senator Dole. Yes—I don't like to answer questions at the President's meeting. I'll be happy to do it later.

Bosnia

Q. Excuse me. Can you tell us more about this possible cease-fire?

The President. No. I mean—and I literally can't tell you more about it. I can tell you that it's being seriously discussed and the parties are talking about how they feel about it and what the obstacles to it are at the present moment. And that's all I can tell you at the present time.

Q. Do you think it's—[inaudible].

The President. No, I didn't say that. I don't know that. I don't know that it's not. I don't know. The answer to that is, I don't know.

Q. Will it happen today or—

The President. I don't know. I think that's highly unlikely.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:20 p.m. in the Truman Conference Center in the New Executive Office Building.

Statement on the Bipartisan Commitment to Our Children

September 29, 1995

All Americans agree that we must protect the lives and future health of our children. The bipartisan "Commitment to Our Children"—in support of this administration's efforts to reduce children's smoking or use of smokeless tobacco products—shows just how deep that sentiment runs through our country. The Representatives and Senators who stood up today for our children deserve the Nation's thanks. These Democrats and Republicans showed that this is not about partisan politics; it is about doing the right thing for our children and families. Public health leaders, children and family advocates, and elected State and local officials from across the Nation have also pledged to support our efforts.

Each day, 3,000 young people become regular smokers. Nearly 1,000 of them will die early from smoking-related diseases. We must reduce children's access to tobacco products and limit the advertising and promotions that tell our children it is cool or glamorous to smoke but do not tell them about the disease and death that also come

with smoking. The stakes are too high not to act.

**Executive Order 12974—
Continuance of Certain Federal
Advisory Committees**
September 29, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Each advisory committee listed below is continued until September 30, 1997.

(a) Committee for the Preservation of the White House; Executive Order No. 11145, as amended (Department of the Interior).

(b) Federal Advisory Council on Occupational Safety and Health; Executive Order No. 12196, as amended (Department of Labor).

(c) National Partnership Council; Executive Order No. 12871 (Office of Personnel Management).

(d) President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans; Executive Order No. 12900 (Department of Education).

(e) President's Board of Advisors on Historically Black Colleges and Universities; Executive Order No. 12876 (Department of Education).

(f) President's Commission on White House Fellowships; Executive Order No. 11183, as amended (Office of Personnel Management).

(g) President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology; Executive Order No. 12882, as amended (Office of Science and Technology Policy).

(h) President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities; Executive Order No. 12367, as amended (National Endowment for the Arts).

(i) President's Committee on the International Labor Organization; Executive Order No. 12216, as amended (Department of Labor).

(j) President's Committee on Mental Retardation; Executive Order No. 11776, as

amended (Department of Health and Human Services).

(k) President's Committee on the National Medal of Science; Executive Order No. 11287, as amended (National Science Foundation).

(l) President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports; Executive Order No. 12345, as amended (Department of Health and Human Services).

(m) President's Export Council; Executive Order No. 12131, as amended (Department of Commerce).

(n) President's National Security Telecommunications Advisory Committee; Executive Order No. 12382, as amended (Department of Defense).

(o) Trade and Environment Policy Advisory Committee; Executive Order No. 12905 (Office of the United States Trade Representative).

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Executive order, the functions of the President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act that are applicable to the committees listed in section 1 of this order, except that of reporting annually to the Congress, shall be performed by the head of the department or agency designated after each committee, in accordance with the guidelines and procedures established by the Administrator of General Services.

Sec. 3. The following Executive orders or sections thereof, which established committees that have terminated or whose work is completed, are revoked:

(a) Executive Order No. 12878, as amended by Executive Order Nos. 12887 and 12912, establishing the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform; and

(b) That portion of section 2 of Executive Order No. 12844 that established the Federal Fleet Conversion Task Force.

Sec. 4. Executive Order No. 12869 is superseded.

Sec. 5. This order shall be effective September 30, 1995.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
September 29, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:17 a.m., October 2, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 3.

**Message to the Congress on the
South Africa-United States
Agreement on the Peaceful Use of
Nuclear Energy**

September 29, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and the Republic of South Africa Concerning Peaceful uses of Nuclear Energy, with accompanying annex and agreed minute. I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the agreement, and the memorandum of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement concerning the agreement. The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Acting Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the agreement and various other attachments, including agency views, is also enclosed.

The proposed agreement with the Republic of South Africa has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (NNPA) and as otherwise amended. In my judgment, the proposed agreement meets all statutory requirements and will advance the non-proliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States. It provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation between the United States and South Africa under appropriate conditions and controls reflecting a strong common commitment to nuclear non-proliferation goals.

The proposed new agreement will replace an existing U.S.-South Africa agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation that entered into force on August 22, 1957, and by its terms would expire on August 22, 2007. The United States suspended cooperation with

South Africa under the 1957 agreement in the 1970's because of evidence that South Africa was embarked on a nuclear weapons program. Moreover, following passage of the NNPA in 1978, South Africa did not satisfy a provision of section 128 of the Atomic Energy Act (added by the NNPA) that requires full-scope IAEA safeguards in non-nuclear weapon states such as South Africa as a condition for continued significant U.S. nuclear exports.

In July 1991 South Africa, in a momentous policy reversal, acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and promptly entered into a full-scope safeguards agreement with the IAEA as required by the Treaty. South Africa has been fully cooperative with the IAEA in carrying out its safeguards responsibilities.

Further, in March 1993 South Africa took the dramatic and candid step of revealing the existence of its past nuclear weapons program and reported that it had dismantled all of its six nuclear devices prior to its accession to the NPT. It also invited the IAEA to inspect its formerly nuclear weapons-related facilities to demonstrate the openness of its nuclear program and its genuine commitment to non-proliferation.

South Africa has also taken a number of additional important non-proliferation steps. In July 1993 it put into effect a law banning all weapons of mass destruction. In April 1995 it became a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), formally committing itself to abide by the NSG's stringent guidelines for nuclear exports. At the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference it played a decisive role in the achievement of indefinite NPT extension—a top U.S. foreign policy and national security goal.

These steps are strong and compelling evidence that South Africa is now firmly committed to stopping the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to conducting its nuclear program for peaceful purposes only.

In view of South Africa's fundamental re-orientation of its nuclear program, the United States proposes to enter into a new agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation with South Africa. Although cooperation could have been resumed under the 1957 agreement, both we and South Africa believe that

it is preferable to have a new agreement completely satisfying, as the proposed new agreement does, the current legal and policy criteria of both sides, and that reflects, among other things:

- Additional international non-proliferation commitments entered into by the parties since 1974, when the old agreement was last amended, including, for South Africa, its adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons;
- Reciprocity in the application of the terms and conditions of cooperation between the parties; and
- An updating of terms and conditions to take account of intervening changes in the respective domestic legal and regulatory frameworks of the parties in the area of peaceful nuclear cooperation.

For the United States, the proposed new agreement also represents an additional instance of compliance with section 404(a) of the NNPA, which calls for an effort to renegotiate existing agreements for cooperation to include the more stringent requirements established by the NNPA.

The proposed new agreement with South Africa permits the transfer of technology, material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. It provides for U.S. consent rights to retransfers, enrichment, and reprocessing as required by U.S. law. It does not permit transfers of any sensitive nuclear technology, restricted data, or sensitive nuclear facilities or major critical components thereof. In the event of termination, key conditions and controls continue with respect to material and equipment subject to the agreement.

From the United States perspective the proposed new agreement improves on the 1957 agreement by the addition of a number of important provisions. These include the provisions for full-scope safeguard; perpetuity of safeguards; a ban on "peaceful" nuclear explosives; a right to require the return of exported nuclear items in certain circumstances; a guarantee of adequate physical security; and a consent right to enrichment of nuclear material subject to the agreement.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. The Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
September 29, 1995.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979

September 29, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order No. 12924 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
September 29, 1995.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

September 22

The President announced his intention to appoint Peter Lucas to be a member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The President nominated former Tennessee Senator Jim Sasser as Ambassador to the People's Republic of China.

September 24

In the morning, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton traveled to Scranton, PA. They returned to Washington, DC, in the evening.

September 26

In the morning, the President had a working visit with President Ion Iliescu of Romania.

The President announced his intention to nominate John N. Erlenborn to the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation.

The President announced his intention to appoint Jill L. Long Thompson as a Department of Agriculture Federal Representative to the Rural Telephone Bank Board.

September 27

In the morning, the President had a telephone conversation with President Boris Yeltsin of Russia.

The President announced that he has named the following individuals to the President's Oklahoma City Scholarship Fund Advisory Board:

- George Nigh, Chair;
- Henry Bellmon;
- Michael Enoch;
- Melvin Hall;
- W.R. Howell;
- Lou C. Kerr;
- Martha King;
- Ruth Leebron Levenson;
- Ronald J. Norick;

- M. Susan Savage;
- James Lee Witt; and
- Stanton Young.

September 28

The President announced his intention to appoint Burton P. Resnick to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

September 29

In the late morning, the President had meetings with President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt and King Hussein I of Jordan.

The President announced his intention to nominate Laveeda Morgan Battle as a member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation.

The White House announced that the President has invited President Suleyman Demirel of Turkey to Washington, DC, for a working visit on October 18.

The White House announced that the President, at the invitation of King Juan Carlos I of Spain, will visit Madrid to attend the United States-European Union summit on December 3.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted September 27

Michael V. Dunn,
of Iowa, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Eugene Branstool, resigned.

Michael V. Dunn,
of Iowa, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice Eugene Branstool, resigned.

Submitted September 29

Patricia A. Gaughan,
of Ohio, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, vice Ann Aldrich, retired.

Joan A. Lenard,
of Florida, to be U.S. District Judge for the
Southern District of Florida, vice James Law-
rence King, retired.

Clarence J. Sundram,
of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for
the Northern District of New York (new po-
sition).

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released September 25

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Released September 26

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's meeting with Romanian President Ion Iliescu

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the first roundtable conference of donors on Angola

Released September 27

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Ambassador Dennis Ross, Special Middle East Coordinator, on the Middle East peace process

Statement by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta on the continuing resolution agreement

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of the Office of Management and Budget Alice Rivlin on Senate passage of the VA/HUD appropriations bill

Released September 28

Joint declaration of the Washington summit

Fact sheet on nuclear materials security in the former Soviet Union

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on action to reduce the risk of illicit transfer of nuclear weapons

Released September 29

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's visit to the United States-European Union summit

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the upcoming visit of Turkish President Suleyman Demirel

White House statement on the Intelligence Oversight Board review of CIA communications to Congress and the Department of Justice

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the Presidential Emergency Board to resolve the dispute between the Metro-North Commuter Railroad and its workers

Announcement of the nomination for U.S. District Judges for the Northern District of Ohio, Southern District of Florida, and the Northern District of New York

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the announcement by the Director of Central Intelligence John Deutch of disciplinary decisions regarding CIA operations in Guatemala

Acts Approved by the President

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.